

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D. D., Editor

August 1919

20 Cents

Vol. 5 No. 6

Editorial Comment	-	-	-	1023
The Church and Reconstruction	-	-		1034
<i>Latta Griswold</i>				
The Proposals: Constitutional Bars	-	-		1048
<i>Charles C. Marshall</i>				
The Council and Creed of Nicaea	-	-		1075
<i>William S. Bishop</i>				
The Gospel According to S. John	-	-		1088
<i>Walter Ovid Kinsolving</i>				
Sunday Morning in Camp	-	-	-	1100
<i>Marshall M. Day</i>				
The Church's Teaching of the Seven Sacraments				1106
<i>Ernest Pugh</i>				
Book Reviews	-	-	-	1110

Application now pending for entry as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 42 Albany Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager

11 West 45th Street

New York

This advertisement is to tell you about one of the most valuable assets of the Episcopal Church

ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE

WHAT IS ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE?

A Christian College for men, furnishing, at the lowest possible cost, an undergraduate training leading to the B.A. degree, of highest scholastic rating,—especially in classics, literature, modern languages, history, economics, sociology, philosophy, and kindred subjects connected with human relationships.

WHO SHOULD GO TO ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE?

Men preparing for commerce, law, literature, journalism, the ministry, politics, social service; those wishing a sound general education.

WHERE IS ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE?

At Annandale, New York, on the east bank of the Hudson River, overlooking the famous Catskill mountains—two hours from New York, one from Albany. Twelve beautiful buildings crown the high bluff.

HOW OLD IS ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE?

The sixtieth collegiate year begins the middle of September.

HOW EXPENSIVE IS ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE?

\$450.00 a year covers tuition, modern and commodious quarters, and excellent board for nine months. Men can go to St. Stephen's who find costs elsewhere prohibitive. Plain living, some endowment, and gifts make this possible.

WHO CONTROLS ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE?

The Episcopal Church, absolutely. Its policies are determined in consultation with the General Board of Religious Education. It is the official college of the Province of New York.

IMPORTANT: THERE ARE ONLY FORTY VACANCIES THIS YEAR AT ST. STEPHEN'S. EARLY APPLICATIONS ARE ADVISED. ADDRESS

The Rev. Bernard Iddings Bell, President

Post-Office: Annandale, N. Y.

Station: Barrytown, on the N. Y. C. R. R.

Longmans, Green & Co.'s New and Recent Publications

THE PRIMITIVE TRADITION OF THE EUCHARISTIC BODY AND BLOOD.

Being the Paddock Lectures, 1919.

By the Rev. LUCIUS WATERMAN, D.D., Rector of St. Thomas, Hanover, N. H. Crown 8vo. \$2.00 *net*.

This volume represents a new attempt at a just presentation of ancient thought concerning the Presence in the Eucharist. The claim is made that the pre-supposition with which students of all types have in the last thousand years approached the great words "This is My body," "This is My blood," is a different pre-supposition from that of all the early Fathers, and of the Church generally for the first eight centuries; the rival pre-suppositions are stated, the testimony of the Fathers dealt with, and some later writers are discussed.

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY.

By CHARLES GORE, D.D., Bishop of Oxford. New Edition. Revised by C. H. Turner, M.A. 8vo. \$6.00 *net*.

"So authoritative a statement of the case for Apostolic Succession, in a style so lucid and so temperate a tone, with, it may be added, so much that is instructive to all students of Church history, is a welcome gift to all parties, and will count among the many services whereby its distinguished author will be gratefully remembered."—*Church Family Newspaper*.

FACTS OF THE FAITH.

Being a Collection of Sermons not hitherto published in Book form.

By the late Rev. H. SCOTT HOLLAND, D.D. Edited with a Preface by the Rev. C. Cheshire, M.A., Editor of *The Commonwealth*. Crown 8vo. \$2.50 *net*.

"A volume of truly great sermons by one of England's greatest theologians and preachers. They are beautiful in style, philosophical, scholarly and yet plain, direct and practical."—*The Congregationalist and Christian World*.

HOPES FOR ENGLISH RELIGION. A New Volume of Sermons.

By JOHN NEVILLE FIGGIS, Litt.D., Hon.D.D. (Glasgow), of the Community of the Resurrection. Crown 8vo. \$2.25 *net*.

PASTORAL LIFE AND WORK TO-DAY.

By the Right Rev. JOHN A. KEMPTHORNE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lichfield. Crown 8vo. \$2.25 *net*.

An attempt is made in this book to give some suggestion which may help the clergy to meet an overwhelming responsibility, and to respond to an unique opportunity.

THE CHRISTIAN MONARCHY, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MODERN PROBLEMS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

By the Rev. WILLIAM CROUCH, B.A. With an Introduction by The Right Hon. The Viscount Halifax. 8vo. *Paper Covers*. \$1.00 *net*.

HISTORY OF ZIONISM, 1600-1918

By NAHUM SOKOLOW. With 89 Portraits and Illustrations, selected and arranged by Israel Solomons. In Two Volumes. 8vo. Vol. I, \$7.50.

MEMOIR OF KENELM HENRY DIGBY

By BERNARD HOLLAND, C.B., Author of "The Life of Spencer Compton, Eighth Duke of Devonshire," etc. 8vo. \$5.00 *net*.

This is a memoir of the life, and a guide to the writings, of the author of the *Broadstone of Honour*, *Mores Catholici*, *Compitum*, and numerous other works.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

Fourth Ave. and 30th St.
New York

THE NEW HYMNAL

With Both Words and Music

The argument in favor of congregational singing is irrefutable. Churches which have supplied their congregations with the New Musical Hymnal testify enthusiastically to this. It is evident on the face of it. The clergy want it. The people want it. The General Convention made it possible by ordering an official musical hymnal. An eminent committee prepared it. An official body publishes it and offers it to churches at \$1.05 a copy and carrying charges, payable 10 per cent a month.

*TO PLACE IT IN THE HANDS OF THE PEOPLE
IS TO PROGRESS*

Published through
The Church Pension Fund
14 Wall Street
New York City

Agents
The H. W. Gray Company
2 West 45th Street
New York City

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 55 Liberty Street, New York

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year

Twenty Cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

Volume V

AUGUST, 1919

Number 6

Constructive Criticism

BISHOP BRENT said recently in speaking of the
Proposals towards Unity, that unless one could make
constructive criticism of the proposed Canon one's lips had
better be silent. It seems to us that the good Bishop is
proceeding on rather a large assumption. He is assuming
that the Proposal in itself is wise and salutary and that
therefore criticism can have to do only with suggesting
changes in method and detail. The reason however that

the Proposals are raising such widespread agitation in the Church is that to many they seem to be radically destructive of fundamental principles of Faith and Order for which the Church has always stood. It is held by many that we have no right to distribute the grace of Holy Orders in so haphazard a fashion. If a trust company to whom we had committed large funds for investment should propose to distribute those funds for various excellent civic purposes, we would doubtless be disposed to criticize the company; and we should not be dissuaded if someone told us that we must utter no word of criticism unless it could be constructive criticism. There are some proposals that are not the proper material upon which to base constructive criticism. The only criticism they deserve is to be thrown out of the window.

However if it be insisted that we should seriously try to make the Proposals such that they would be acceptable to those who are now so deeply distressed by them, we would suggest that the Canon be amended so that it may provide that in case the minister of any Christian denomination wishes to seek ordination to the priesthood at the hands of one of our bishops, the bishop shall authorize a discreet and learned priest of his diocese to instruct the congregation over which the aforesaid minister has charge in the faith and worship and discipline of the Church, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer; and further that the bishop shall make a visitation for the purpose of confirming the adult members of said congregation. With the further safeguard that such minister and congregation shall in the future be subject to the authority of the said bishop, we can see no reason why the Proposals should not be adopted.

The Bible and Bolshevism

THE following statement has appeared in the *London Times*:

"Mr. John Pollock, who escaped from the Gosocho-vaya Prison in Petrograd, and has just returned to England, informs us that the Bible is prohibited in Bolshevik prisons as a 'counter-revolutionary' book."

We had long suspected that the present Soviet government in Russia was hostile to the Orthodox Church in as much as it has prohibited all public worship in the churches along with other public meetings of any sort whatever. The children in the schools are being systematically trained in atheism and Christianity is not allowed to be taught. The children are also being given absolute liberty in the matter of education, and in consequence all discipline has been removed from their lives. The principles of democracy have been relentlessly applied to the training of the young. They are permitted to do whatever they like and are encouraged to throw off all restraint of parental authority. In addition to all this they are being systematically corrupted and debauched. Thus are the seeds being sown of atheism and anarchy and complete materialism. They are sowing the wind, and they will reap the whirlwind.

We are amazed that there are still people in the Church, even some of the clergy, who cannot see the utter inconsistency between Christianity and Bolshevism. One is based upon love, the other upon the bitter hatred of class warfare. One is spiritual and other-worldly, the other is materialistic and earthly. One teaches that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth; the other teaches that it does. The clergy that are giving hospitable encouragement to the various

forms of radical socialism and anarchy that are spreading their propaganda in this country are engaged in the amusing process of sawing off the bough on which they are sitting.

Suffragan Bishops

THE New York Diocesan Convention nearly went into a panic upon receiving the request from Bishop Greer from his sick-bed in the hospital that the Convention elect another suffragan bishop to lighten the burden of the Bishop of New York. Dr. Cummings almost had a stroke of apoplexy as he leaped to his feet and proposed that the whole matter be laid over till the next day for discussion. He had visions, no doubt that a suffragan might be elected who would soon compel everyone in the diocese of New York to go to confession. Certain stalwart defenders of the faith held hurried conferences with bated breath to consider how such a calamity as the election of another suffragan might be averted. They no doubt had fears that some priest might be elected to this office who would surrender all the treasures of the Church to the hungry wolves without.

Why is it that so many men see red as soon as there is mention of the election of any kind of a bishop? Is it because they hate to be taken unawares and thus prevented from canvassing for their favorite candidate? Is it because they are afraid to leave so important a matter to the action of the Holy Spirit?

After all, is it so important a matter? A suffragan bishop is little more than a secretary to the diocesan, or at most an assistant. It is not considered unusual that a rector of a parish should select his curates. Why should it be thought so preposterous that the bishop of a diocese

should have some choice as to the kind of man he wants to assist him in his administrative work?

We must confess that in this particular instance we had considerable sympathy for Bishop Greer. It seems altogether unjust that the bishop of so large a diocese as New York should not have more assistants. We should have preferred that he had asked for four suffragan bishops instead of one. The Apostles turned over all of the work of serving tables to deacons. The Roman Church today relieves the bishop of a diocese by assigning the administrative tasks connected with his office to the Vicar General and Auxiliary Bishops. Why should we not in all our large dioceses have several suffragan Bishops. It could be the duty of one of them to look after the financial affairs of the diocese. Another could devote himself to recruiting candidates for the ministry and ordaining them. Another could visit the parishes and missions for confirmation. Another could represent the diocese on all important committees whether ecclesiastical, civic, or national. This would leave the Bishop free for the ministry of the Word and for prayer. He could be the spiritual leader and teacher of his diocese that he was intended to be. This is plainly the intention of the Church as expressed in the ordinal.

Why must we go on being so hopelessly conservative and stupid in the way we administer the affairs of the Church? What wonder the Bishops resign from their sees. The astonishing thing is not that some resign, but that all do not resign. We take our best men and give them impossible tasks to perform and leave them no time for study or for prayer; and then we criticize our Bishops because they are neither far-sighted and prophetic leaders of thought nor spiritually-minded men of God.

The Effect of the War on Religion

THE paper on "War and Religion" which was read before the Church Congress by the Rev William Austin Smith, Editor of the *Churchman*, was published in the *Nation* of May 10th. For the first half of the article we have nothing but praise. We must confess however that we have seldom come across so many statements in any article to which we felt prompted to reply as in the second half of this article. The chief difficulty is that we cannot make out what the writer is driving at. We wish he had been more explicit. No doubt the limitations of space prevented him from giving examples which would make his meaning more clear. As it stands however the arraignment of the Church as contained in the article is most puzzling and confusing.

For example he says that "concerning 60 per cent. of the things which the churches are discussing, is it not true that the plain man in the street cannot for the life of him see what they have to do with Jesus Christ?" What are these things? Does he mean the creeds and sacraments, the ministry, the Church, worship, prayer, or repentance? These are some of the things that are being discussed very widely and preached about in many of our pulpits. If Mr. Smith does not mean these things what does he mean?

Then he seems to be much exercised about the plain man. He thinks that when the Master Himself walks our streets, the plain man would understand what He meant: "When Jesus of the Gospels speaks, men uncover. They do not follow Him, for His sayings are hard, but they know that they are hearing the voice of God. When the churches begin to elaborate their system, the plain man is confused."

We confess that we are here entirely in the dark. We have never met this plain man of whom he speaks. Does Mr. Smith mean that the Church should stop teaching and wait for Jesus to walk through our streets? What is it that confuses the plain man? Must we simply read the sayings of our Lord from the Gospels and never teach the plain man who our Lord is? Are we in our pulpits to talk merely about the Jesus of the Gospels and say nothing of the eschatological Christ, the Christ of nineteen centuries of Christian experience? It is all very well to say that the simple sayings of our Lord would be understood if He were teaching them today in our streets. But He is not teaching them today in our streets. Surely we must say something as to who He was and why we should consider His sayings at all.

"We are carrying too much luggage. What we call our deposit of truth has grown too bulky. It saps our energy to guard and display it. The originals are all there, but their lustre is obscured by the setting. The world can be saved by about one-fifth of the bulk of religious truth which we apply to its problems." The deposit of truth is too bulky,—then what are we to throw over? Mr. Smith writes as if he wanted us to keep only certain moral principles, and at most that we should teach human brotherhood and the love of God. This is indeed the gospel according to Harnack, but it is not the Gospel according to S. John or S. Paul. S. Paul has a good deal more to talk about than human brotherhood and the love of God.

"Christianity ought always to be in the hands of romanticists. The tragic waste of organized religion from the beginning has been that it has so often been administered 'by souls prematurely gray,' incapable of risk and greatness. Will the institutions which Christianity has

fashioned be permitted to impede the spirit, or will the spirit be permitted to go joyfully, fearlessly, carelessly forward to claim the world for Christ?" We must confess that we have not the same confidence in romanticists that Mr. Smith has. He would have us commit the religion of Christ to those who are fearless and careless and who would insist on going forward and throwing to the winds all the truths of revealed religion to which anyone might object. It is a strange conception of religion which regards only the great fundamentals as of any value, or which despises anything of less importance. It is very much as if one should say that life was the only thing of importance in a human being and that therefore it made no difference whether his body was in good condition or not. This would be to ignore the importance of the bodily functions in producing a healthy, normal kind of life. Of course everybody knows that certain details in the organization of the Church are not to be put on the same level as the love of God and the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit. But if it is through such details as baptism, confirmation, and ordination that the love of God is developed in the human soul and the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit is brought to bear upon human needs and difficulties, why then plainly these things are of extreme importance whatever the romanticists may think about them.

"The churches produce pharisaism more naturally than they produce heresy. There would never have been a heretic if there had never been any pharisees, for the love which is in Christ Jesus throws far a circle which, if we let it, will include and win the erring. Never since Christianity started its course has there been the slightest danger from heresy. The tragic danger has been that we have let the

pharisee speak for Christ." We should be very much interested to learn what Mr. Smith understands by Pharisaism. We had always supposed that the fundamental sin of the Pharisees was hypocrisy, but the connection between that and the production of heresy we fail to see. Furthermore if Mr. Smith thinks there has never been the slightest danger from heresy why does he blame Pharisaism for having produced it? What can be a man's conception of religion who says there has never been any danger from heresy, when everybody knows that the whole sad state of Christendom today with all its multiplicity of sects and variety of beliefs is due primarily to heresy?

"Have we faced the implication of the fact that Jesus did not get on with religious people?" If our Lord did not get on with religious people how are we to account for the fact that all His Apostles and most devoted followers were taken from that class? Certainly it was the devout and God-fearing among the Jews that furnished the nucleus of the early Christian Church. Some of the leading Pharisees became the leaders of the Church, such as Saul of Tarsus. Apparently Mr. Smith would have us turn over the Christian religion to the irreligious people of the world, as if they cared anything about it or would take any interest in its preservation or propagation.

"The war has taught us that the Church will not be free until it becomes democratic, and by democratic I mean that the layman shall have a voice not only in its material governance but in its worship, its faith and polity. And by laymen I do not mean ecclesiastical laymen." Who are the laymen who want to have a voice in determining the worship, the faith, and the polity of the Church? We have never met them. All of the laymen whom we have been privileged to know have been for the most part humble-

mind men whose one desire was to have the Church tell them what they ought to believe and do. We venture to say that very few of the lay deputies of General Convention would wish to dictate what should be the faith of the Church. Does Mr. Smith think that the clergy invented the Christian religion? Does he not know that in all ages the Bishops have simply borne witness to what was handed down from the beginning? Bishops did not invent new doctrines, they simply testified what was the sacred tradition of the faith that had been entrusted to them as custodians of the revealed truth of God. It will not make a religious statement more true to have it declared by laymen, however ignorant they may be.

"The problem is how to get back to the churches the unchurched majority of Christians. These people represent the biggest church in Christendom." Why this extreme interest in the church of the unchurched, we wonder? Who has unchurched them? It would be extraordinary if with all the varieties of religion we have today, anyone who wanted to be a Christian could not find some kind of a church which would appeal to him. Why wave aside thus cavalierly all the most devoted followers of Christ in the world today, whether they be Roman Catholics, or Orthodox, or Anglicans, or Presbyterians, or Baptists, or Methodists? Surely the chief problem of church unity is with them and not with people who have not the slightest desire to be Christians of any kind.

"What does the unchurched man want of religion? He wants religion to explain what it means. We parsons have got off easy heretofore. The Church has got off easy." Has not religion been explaining what it meant for ages in sermons and instructions and confirmation classes and

creeds and formularies and religious books and periodicals. Surely the unchurched man can find out about religion today if he wants to. Let him subscribe to the *Churchman*, and at the end of a year he will be wiser about the meaning of religion than he was at the beginning. What is the reason for this obsession that the Church is to blame for all the irreligion in the world? Surely the unchurched man has some portion of the blame resting upon him.

"The democratizing of religion will, perhaps, mean what the democratizing of government has meant, the putting of its offices at the service of the plain men. Our sacramental system, our creeds, our liturgy must be made plain to the ordinary man. Democracy asks blunt questions . . . It must serve the plain man or the plain man will make a democratic Church." Where do we find the plain man today in the largest numbers if not in the Roman Catholic Church, where the plain man never joins in the recitation of the creeds, where the sacraments are administered and the liturgy is celebrated in an unknown tongue? We are hearing a good deal today about the democratizing of religion. Surely there is danger of forgetting that the Church Militant is an army and that thus far in the history of the world democratic armies have never been found very useful. In the Church, as in the army, discipline and obedience are primary essentials. We saw enough of democratic armies on the Russian front after the revolution, when the soldiers voted to give up fighting and murder their generals, and thus allowed the German forces they had been fighting to be thrown upon the Western front. If that is the kind of army we want the Church to be, then let us hasten to democratize religion.

The Church and Reconstruction*

BY THE REV. LATTA GRISWOLD, M.A.

IT is important at once that we should clarify our ideas as to the meaning of Reconstruction, before we venture to discuss the contribution that the Church may or should make thereto. I assume, in the first place, that it is not the Reconstruction of the Church to which our attention is requested. Though, indeed, there are many who apparently feel that the Church is, above all others, the institution that most needs to be reconstructed. The magic phrase has captivated those within her pale as well as those without. The collapse of governments, the crumbling of long-established nations, the extraordinary confusion of the political and economic activities of men (of which the Peace Conference has so far vainly been trying to take toll and make account) has generated almost everywhere an atmosphere of revolution. Even in stable societies (among which we still gladly include America), we are told, on the highest authority that there are "voices in the air" saying all sorts of things, whispering of change, babbling of the New Freedom that shall emancipate us from all sorts of vague slaveries and corruptions. These voices penetrate even the ears of churchmen, and under their subtle and persuasive influence, in the name of the sacred concept of Unity (a blanket concept which, like charity, covers a multitude of sins) it has been actually proposed that we "reconstruct" the Church. In the luminous fog that passes for the mind of some eminent ecclesiastics, revolutionary proposals have been conceived that might well have led an unwary writer to suppose that this was

* An address before the Convocation of Springfield (West. Mass.), June 3, 1919.

the problem to which he had been invited to address himself. I could almost wish that were the case.

I take it, however, that today we are interested in another sort of reconstruction, the sort of reconstruction that like a river choked with verbiage is flowing through the public press. We are thinking of the reconstruction that has to do with the terms of peace which shall constitute the point of departure for our renewed international life; the reconstruction that has to do with those international arrangements that shall guarantee the peace eventually made, if indeed eventually a peace be made; the common international policy that shall make the world safe for Democracy, or even more happily shall strive, in the appropriate words of a Governor of Massachusetts, to make Democracy safe for the world. We are thinking of the legislative and commercial arrangements that shall protect the rights and improve the conditions of labor everywhere, the while they stimulate the production so essential to our economic recuperation. We are seeking, or at least there are those who are seeking for us, the magic formula whereby wages shall continue to go up and the cost of living immediately go down, whereby the hours of work may be decreased and yet the more wealth be speedily produced to replace the greivous destruction inevitable in all war and the wastage wantonly indulged in our own administration of the war. We are thinking again of how to reconcile our morals and our pocketbooks; sacrifice billions to our righteous zeal for prohibition and yet abolish the taxes that gnaw most painfully into the smallest incomes. We are thinking, I hope, of the sort of reconstruction that, with fair consideration to the tender susceptibilities of the Government and the Opposition, (or shall we now put it, to the tender susceptibilities of the President

and the Congress?) shall endeavor to restore to us our traditional form of representative government and unscramble the powers that during war time were necessarily concentrated under executive control. For the Presidential omelet has attained such swollen proportions as to make it difficult for even a deserving Democrat to digest. We are thinking of the solution of the complicated problems, made acute by if not originating in the war—Prohibition, Woman Suffrage, the railroads, immigration, a budget system of national finance, demobilization, employment for soldiers, shipping, a protective tariff for the infant industries born of the laudable effort to supply us with materials formerly purchased from Germany, and a thousand others doubtless of greater or lesser import. We have in mind, I take it, the sort of reconstruction for which, since it is baffling the ingenuity of our greatest statesman, it causes a country parson no embarrassment to confess that he has no program. He has opinions on this and that, and he fain would wish that he had opportunity to do more than now and then cast a vote by way of making them tell upon his fellows. But at present he will strictly limit himself to the discussion of what he conceives to be the relation of the Church to this question of Reconstruction, and by the Church, he means, for purposes of convenience, that body which our Constitution and Canons discreetly call "This Church."

My conception of the relation of the Church to these problems of Reconstruction is that *in the direct sense it has none.*

I believe intensely that the capital error of historic Catholicism has been its successive alliances with the State, when the Church figured as the inspiration, or the ally, or the sovereign of the Holy Roman Empire; or when since her

unhappy divisions various portions of the Church have been afflicted with "establishment;" or when as today here or there or anywhere she officially interferes in civic affairs. I do not conceive that the Church *has* a political rôle to play, any more than I believe her to be primarily a philanthropic institution, an orphan asylum, a hospital, or an almshouse. A part of the Church's work obviously is the distribution of charity in the broadest sense; but charitable enterprise is a secondary aspect of her activity. I cannot imagine why "This Church" should as a body express her opinion as to the League of Nations, as to Labor Legislation, government ownership, or the proposed alliance with France plus the general alliance with half the world in the League of Nations, any more than I can see why officially she should commit herself to allopathy against homeopathy, or for osteopathy against either. And incidentally, I may remark, that I regard it as a piece of intolerable effrontery for the editors of church papers to undertake to dictate to churchmen their political opinions.

The Church is primarily—I am tempted to say, *exclusively*—the organ and the medium of religion, the channel of communication between God and man. She has one great task—to minister the religion of Jesus Christ. The mission of Jesus Christ was not to reform the world, but to save the world; not to democratize society, but to evangelize society; not to create good citizens of any particular political complexion, but to regenerate men to be good citizens of the Kingdom of God. By the divine precept which is her sole charter, and by the example of her practice during the days of her purest zeal and most loyal obedience, she is commissioned to undertake this ministration on two particular lines—by the preaching of the Gospel of salvation from sin through faith in Jesus Christ, and by the admin-

istration to the souls she converts from the domination of the world the sacraments ordained by her Lord for their spiritual cleansing and sustenance.

The Church's chief and fundamental task is to preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments, and she is charged with no other essential mission, and has time or grace or equipment for no other mission. All else is but contributory, subsidiary thereto, or merely the natural and appropriate expression thereof. She heals the sick and cares for the stranger and the fatherless precisely of the charity whereof she buries the dead. If such indeed be the mission of the Church (and surely there is warrant for the assumption!) it follows inevitably that it is likewise the principal task of her ministry, of all who are concerned with her organized activity, with her vestries, convocations, synods, conventions, whether they be ministers or laymen.

Though time lacks to defend the thesis, I hazard it as an assertion that if the Church is weak or ineffective or is a negligible influence in the community, if in the many civic institutions around her, of which her members are also members, there are abuses and corruptions, if there are too-revolutionary or over-reactionary tendencies at work, it is not because in any instance the Church has maintained a negative or a wrong attitude toward these institutions or toward any of the principles for which they may stand; but because in the pulpit and in the pews she has failed in the ministration of the Word and the Sacraments. I have no patience with and attach no importance to those futile criticisms that fault the Church for her attitude toward political or economic or sociological questions. But I am literally appalled by the frequent character of her preaching, clerical and lay. Too much has the Gospel been watered down to suit the worldly preoccupations and interests and

conduct of the secularized lay folk to whom she has looked too subserviently for her support. Too frequently has her character and her constitution, rooted in the supernatural and revealed by divinity, been shaped to the pattern cut by German infidels in the last half-century, for the purpose of accommodating herself to the free-thinking prejudices of those broad-minded intellectuals to whom she has been ashamed not to make her appeal. Too often, through weakness or weariness or laziness or supine amiability, for the vigorous Gospel of the salvation of souls from the power of sin and the wrath to come, has been substituted those literary bouquets, that pious fluff, that sanctimonious gab, that has led so many red-blooded people to suppose her message concerns only sentimental old ladies of both sexes. Every political, economic, and social theorist, save Nietzsche the crazy Hun, has appealed to Jesus Christ, and with some justice in that he finds in Jesus the exemplification of those positive righteous qualities which may inhere in his system, however little Jesus may stand for the exaggerations or the logical implications of other elements of his theory. The Church is not concerned as a body (as *the body* of Christ) with the temporary arrangements that men of all sorts devise for their political, economic, and social life, based as so many of them are upon the inferred or empirical good of the greatest number. She is solely concerned with those eternal principles and that permanent arrangement that men must make with God or be "damned," whatever or however horrible a thing damnation may mean.

"The Church Impotent here in Earth" is the striking title of one of the many foolish books that have sought to fault the Church for her failure to propose in ecclesiastical synods formulæ that shall reconstruct our battered civilization. But the Church's impotence is not measured by her

reaction to even such a catastrophe as the war, but solely by her habitual age-long reaction to the warfare of God against sin and ignorance of his will. She has but one formula to suggest—and that not to the State, but to the members of the Kingdom—the Golden Rule; and even to the word *liberty* (so precious a political term), when she breathes it, she adds *wherewith Christ hath made us free*.

I am supremely indifferent to what the Church, this Church, or any other portion of her, what any convocation or synod or convention or even general council may have to say about the League of Nations, or the employment of soldiers, or free trade, or the alliance with France; but I am very zealous that she should positively and eloquently and persuasively and tenderly preach the eternal Gospel of the Love of God who gave his only begotten Son that all who believe on him should not perish but should have eternal life. It is a revival of religion that we need in the Church, and not a symposium on economics or politics.

I am further persuaded that if the Church is found somehow to have failed to minister effectively to the life of the community, of which—after all—it is but a fraction still, that failure lies not only in some misrepresentation or denial or neglect of the Gospel, but to some laxity or some corruption in the administration of those means of grace, which, as the Lord hath said, are sufficient for us Christians.

For example, one may well doubt if the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, the very means whereby we become Christians, is with many of the laity or even with many of the clergy more than a routine duty, fully discharged with the final admonition to the sponsors at the font to call upon the tender babe to hear sermons and to bring him at some vague future time to the Bishop to be

confirmed. Do we seriously believe, and if we do believe, do we thereafter act on the belief—clergy, sponsors, parents—that children brought to Baptism *are* verily made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven? Is it not rather, in the great majority of cases, a mere ceremonial and traditional method of giving a name? Really, we pay more attention to the manners of our housemaids that we do often to the nurture of the Christian child in the principles and practice of religion. Our erring Roman sister sets us, in this respect, a good example. And yet we fatuously marvel at the devotion and loyalty of her members; and still more fatuously sometimes ascribe to “ignorance” what is more often a *knowledge* of the elements of religion. We should be ashamed to condemn so lightly a virtue that surely is a flower in the Papal garden though it bloom amidst whatever weeds. *Our* stupid policy is to wait (save for the innocuous practice of holding Sunday School) until children reach those mystic “years of discretion,” in reality most often the age of puberty,—those few short strange years when the boy or girl is least susceptible to spiritual influences and most open to all the influences of sense,—and then in six short weeks (which usually means six brief instructions) we seek to convey the whole cycle of Christian doctrine, church history, Christian ethics, and religious practice to the tense self-conscious youth. All this should be the gradual careful training of many years. And yet we wonder why we produce so few well-instructed and well-grounded church-people!

The truth is we carelessly, perfunctorily, inefficiently administer Christ’s sacrament of Baptism.

May we feel that the other great sacrament of the Gospel is more satisfactorily administered? On the whole, we can.

There has been an encouraging revival of Eucharistic worship in the Church for many years now. The service of the Holy Communion has been rescued from the obscurity and desuetude into which it had fallen during the eighteenth century. It is in most churches celebrated with sufficient frequency at least to meet the demands of the majority in the congregation. It has been readorned with much of the fitting and beautiful ceremonial that the piety and taste of our forefathers devised. More positive teaching is somewhat general, and the Real Absence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament is almost nowhere belligerently stressed now as was once the unfortunate case.

But one wonders if the great body of churchmen, clerical and lay, will ever adequately realize that this Church, by her formularies, her Prayer Book, her traditions, her Catholic claims, is a Church of which the sacraments are the heart and soul of her life and practice? Surely it were superfluous to repeat the arguments for the sacramental character of the Christian system or to advance afresh the indisputable reasons that make the Eucharist the chief act of worship, the essential means of grace, the vital communion between the soul and God!

One wonders, I say, for one particular reason, if not, indeed, for many. In most churches (and in the majority of our strongest parishes) the Eucharistic service is relegated to an inconvenient hour, and in almost all such churches it is celebrated without the accessories of beauty and dignity with which we glorify (and overload, since they do not fit it) our Solemn High Morning Prayer. The clergy are by no means chiefly responsible, though partially so. There are many priests who would restore the Eucharist to its proper place in the Church's worship, and they refrain from doing so not from deliberate choice but be-

cause they are simply heartsick at the prospect of the painful row that would likely ensue on the subject of what to them is the holy of holies in the worship and devotion of their souls. And yet, however or whyever we fail, this Church will never recover the power of the Sacrament until the Sacrament again is made generally the central act of her corporate worship and the duty of assisting thereat at least once each Sunday the supreme obligation of all of her members.

It would be painful to indicate the nature of the opposition to Eucharistic revival. I hold no brief for Reservation or Benediction, for I am of the opinion that both, fortunately or unfortunately, are not permitted by our formularies. But the temper of the opposition can be gauged by the well-known fact that in many dioceses a priest would let himself in for considerable more trouble from his bishop and from his parishioners if he practiced Reservation or Benediction than if he openly in his pulpit denied the Virgin Birth or the Bodily Resurrection of the Lord.

We do not yet effectively administer Christ's Sacrament of his Body and Blood.

If the assertion is warranted, surely the Church's primary duty is to address herself to the revival of her zeal, to the education of her people, and to the reform of her practice. And she has much to do to set her own house in order.

It is conceivable that at this point many of you, whether you happen to be agreeing with what I have been saying or not, are being tempted to exclaim, But what has all this to do with the relation of the Church to Reconstruction?

I can but repeat that directly, corporately, officially the Church has nothing to do with reconstruction. But I hasten to add,—*indirectly* the Church has a great deal to do with

Reconstruction. One fears that those who plead for the direct action of the Church on political, economic, and sociological affairs forget the sharp antithesis in which the Saviour himself placed the Church and the world. It would be difficult—nay, quite impossible—to show that our Lord anticipated at any time the identification of his Kingdom with organized society. On the contrary, he pictured the Kingdom as in the world but not of it, and predicted that many of its principles would always be in violent contradiction with the principles of the world. The Kingdom was to prove a leavening influence indeed, and it has so proved; but there were ample warnings (and history has demonstrated their justification) that the contact of the Church and the world would not always be to the advantage of the Church. It was even contemplated by our Lord that the power of the world might prove deadly to the Church; and he could ask, with something more than rhetorical effect, should he find faith on the earth when he came again?

Christians in every age have made the profound mistake of identifying the development of an idealistic social order with the coming of the Kingdom in fulness and power; with little justification, however, as we should learn both from the reading of the Gospel and from the study of history. We were so sanguine about the leavening influence of Christian religion before the war, and proudly regarded the progress of civilization as a sure indication of the gradual coming of the Kingdom. And yet, even before the war, it needed but a careful analysis of civilization to reveal the fact that it embodied in its legislation, in its international polity, or in its social theory, not one fundamental Christian principle. It needed but the horrid shock of the war to reveal to us the bankruptcy of our political, social, and economic standards, and to demonstrate their impotence to

thwart the disaster of unrestrained human passion. The latent good in human nature did, however, on the whole rise to the challenge and by the power of a mighty sacrifice (revealing thus its divine possibilities) obtain the victory over the organized evil of the chief aggressor; and since the cessation of the actual fighting (despite the disturbing reactions along so many lines) hope, engendered by the generosity of the sacrifice, has dreamed for the future, if not a Christian civilization, what it idealistically calls a new world. It will be, we are determined, a better world; but we are doomed to stern disillusion if we imagine that it will be even Utopia, much less the Kingdom of God. The degree of betterment we may achieve for reconstructed society will be *indirectly* determined by the Church; or more exactly, by the influence of Christian men, churchmen, in the affairs of the world; for it is our obvious duty to ameliorate, even if we cannot perfect; to make Christian principle tell, if we cannot make it prevail.

And that I conceive is the effect of the preaching of the true Gospel and of the right administration of the sacraments—to produce converted men and women, whose wills are bent on serving God, who will act as citizens of whatever state in which they may find themselves, in the spirit of that faith which has made them what they are. Their task is to help to the best of their ability in making the best possible reconstruction of disordered society, not merely because so to act is in itself righteous, but because the more all human organization is leveled up the more readily and naturally can the appeal of God be made to individual souls. The task of Christians in a very literal sense is to make a pathway in the desert for the Son of God.

The Church as a body is not charged with the regulation

of secular affairs, but churchmen *are* charged with making the best contribution possible to the welfare of the world.

In conclusion, may I make a special plea? It seems to me that in this age of reconstruction, one of the pressing duties of intelligent churchmen is to address themselves to coming to a clearer and better understanding of that great unsolved problem of the relation of the Church to the State. It is a problem of great difficulty and perplexity, and this or that aspect of it is so almost inextricably interwoven with our history, and with the history of all those democratic institutions from which our national system is derived; it is so confused in most minds by incoherent and yet positive traditions, by prejudices, and by the standards of the political parties with which as citizens we are affiliated, that the average man of intelligence is apt to be discouraged in attacking it and confused by the study of it, unless that study be patient and thorough. Yet it is, it seems to me, the vital intellectual problem of the present time, the rightful heir to the problems left unsolved by the vain philosophic speculation made in Germany which we are now instinctively discarding and which will not soon trouble us again. It may be that we ourselves shall accomplish very little, but it is certainly a task which churchmen should undertake; and I look forward with eager anticipation to the day when another great churchman of the temper and devotion and clarity of St. Augustine shall produce a new *City of God* that shall blaze the way for the Church through the tangled forest of modern disorder.

I venture to suggest three books, which I am certain will open the eyes of their readers as to the nature and extent of the problem to which I refer. These are:—first, "Churches and the Modern State" by Father Neville Figgis, of the Community of the Resurrection, whose recent

death is a serious loss to Christendom, for of all modern writers he had the surest grasp on this great problem. The second is Mr. March Lisle Phillips' "Europe Unbound," the most profound philosophical and political analysis of the war, a picture of the causes of the war drawn with the boldest strokes upon the largest canvas. And the third is Dr. David Jayne Hill's "The Rebuilding of Europe," in which the author takes what are practically the principles derived by Father Figgis from an analysis of the constitution and history of the Church and applies them as the standard for the reconstruction of peace in the present crisis. These three books do little more than open the door upon this vast subject, but I know no others that so clearly reveal the real scope of reconstruction and so clearly indicate the task before Christian men if the principles of the Gospel are to have influence in coming civilization.

The more I reflect upon theological, philosophical, and political subjects, the more profoundly am I convinced that we should root and ground ourselves in fundamental principles of the faith. Certainly we should keep our minds open to fresh revelations of deeper truth and to the ever-new discoveries of scientific fact; but in these restless days of transition, when the spirit of revolution and destruction is in the air, and when in so many quarters the primitive instincts and passions are unchained, I fear we are in danger of being led astray from such sound principle by sentimental proposals that promise the Golden Age upon the adoption of their plausible formulæ. Radical change is far more dangerous in a critical time of transition than in the more stable conditions that obtain after a long peace. Above all, I fear those appeals to sentiment to make rash experiments simply because the end proposed is what we all desire.

The Proposals For An Approach Towards Unity

Constitutional Bars

BY CHARLES C. MARSHALL.

THE Proposers do not claim to effect what they call organic unity. They say they propose merely an Approach towards Unity. To follow the intricacies and the baffling distinctions involved in a close adherence to their terms has been found impossible in this article. The questions discussed here are discussed under the plain term "unity," unity *pro tanto*. If intercommunion is not unity, what is?

They seek through a species of ordination of a sectarian¹ minister by a Protestant Episcopal bishop, to create a minister of what they call the "Church Universal."² Their Apologist expressly states,³ "He (the minister) does not thereby become a minister of this Church (the Protestant Episcopal), but being a priest of the Catholic Church he is competent to exercise his ministry in this Church."

¹ The word "sectarian" is used in this article with entire respect. In using it, and in using the word "Church" in regard to the Protestant Episcopal body, nothing more is intended than both sides express in their very origin and being, the latter an affirmation of and connection with the Episcopate of Apostolic Succession, the former the repudiation of it.

² See Statement prefixed to and published with the proposed canon.

³ See the Apology prepared by Mr. George Zabriskie, one of the Proposers, their Honorary Secretary and Chancellor of the Diocese of New York, published in the June number of this magazine, p. 844.

I.

What the Proposers seek is impossible in the nature of things and legislation to the end proposed would for that reason be null and void.

The Protestant Episcopal Church is an association of people drawn together by a fundamental faith which is the identity, the personality, the soul of the association. That association of people have taken a franchise from the state, have incorporated and in virtue thereof have come into legal, corporate existence. The corporation is the form or body. The fundamental faith is the identity, the personality, the soul. Herein the religious corporation is *sui generis*. The secular corporation may change its constitution and its membership and amend itself into what shape it will. The religious corporation in the nature of things cannot so change. It is always determined by that identity, that personality, that soul. And even where it has adopted a written constitution assuming to express that fundamental faith and has inserted in that constitution the power to amend its provisions, that power is limited by that personality and must be used to promote, not to destroy it, for that personality is obviously in relation to the corporation and constitution preëxistent and paramount. If the power to amend is pushed to the point of destroying that fundamental faith, impairing that personality, it is an unlawful act and would result in corporate death unless it were arrested and redressed through an appeal to the secular courts.

The members of this religious corporation, the Protestant Episcopal Church, were and are part of that great number of baptized people called the "Catholic Church," but in reality not a church—a mere concept or theory—

not a legal entity or organization. The members of this Protestant Episcopal Church cannot and do not sustain any relation in the law to that number of baptized people we call the Catholic Church whether we regard them as individuals or as gathered into other religious corporations, and The Protestant Episcopal Church cannot appoint (ordain) an officer, i. e. a minister or priest for that number of baptized people we call the Catholic Church whether we regard them as individuals or as gathered into other religious corporations. No such officer could in any valid, legal or actual sense be so appointed without the consent of those to whom he is appointed. The whole number of baptized people regarded as individuals are in the law incompetent to give any assent that could sustain such appointment, and if they are regarded as gathered into a number of religious corporations they emphatically withhold the assent necessary to such appointment. The attempt to make such an appointment is an attempt to do the impossible, involves an absurdity and is null and void.

There are officers, ministers or priests of the Protestant Episcopal Church, of the Church of England, of the Church of Rome, of the Greek Church, all of which churches are legal entities—have a legal existence. In the spiritual or ideal sense each of these officers is or may claim to be a priest in relation to that number of people we call the “Catholic Church,” but of that, as we have said, the Law can take no notice. It is conceptual, not actual.

It is axiomatic that an officer, minister, or priest cannot be legally created by the Protestant Episcopal Church or by any other religious corporation for people outside its membership without the assent of those persons. Their assent, as we have seen, cannot be had. *Ex officio* officers cannot in a legal sense, if in any sense, be created by a so-

ciety for those outside of its membership who are incompetent to assent or who refuse assent. It is impossible to arrive at any comprehension of what the Apologist means by a minister who "is not a minister of this Church" but is "competent to exercise his ministry in this Church." We can hardly form a mental conception of the Apologist as not Chancellor of the Diocese of New York yet competent to exercise his chancellorship therein.

A part cannot be equal to the whole. The University of Oxford is, we will say, an association of some sixteen different incorporated societies or colleges. This association is directed in a measure by a University Council. Each college has the power to appoint its own professors and each professor upon such appointment becomes *ex officio* a member of the University Council with the title of Professor of the University of Oxford. Would it not be manifestly absurd to claim that the College of Magdalen could appoint a professor of the University of Oxford without making him a professor of the College of Magdalen?

It will be urged that in the case of the Proposed Canon there is to be a congregation assenting to the ordination of the minister, but it is obvious that the assent of this single congregation could not operate outside of its own membership and would be incompetent to sustain the claim to ordination in any actual sense as a priest of the "Church Universal" or the "Catholic Church."

But this is not all. The Fundamental Faith and the written Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church require the laying on of hands by the Episcopate as just as essential to a valid laity—a valid congregation—as to a valid ministry. The Proposers apparently recognize the laying on of hands as essential to a valid ministry, but they refuse to regard it as essential to a valid laity. Just

why, they do not explain, but the result is that the essential of a valid laity with its assent is lacking in the approach. There cannot be a contract with only one party. This defect inheres in the "Approach" from whatever point it is examined. The Episcopate—call it the Episcopate of Apostolic Succession, the Catholic Episcopate, the Historic Episcopate, the Episcopate of Grace—it matters not what it is called,—what it means, always has meant and ever must mean in the Protestant Episcopal Church is that Episcopate whose office in the laying on of hands is as essential to a valid laity as to a valid ministry and whereof Confirmation is the power no less than Ordination. It goes without saying that that is the Episcopate of Apostolic Succession.

II.

What the Proposers seek would violate Article VIII of the Constitution and their proposed canon if formally enacted would be null and void as a violation of said Article.

The fundamental Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church is comprised in the Constitution, the provisions of which can be altered and amended by the General Convention only after certain formalities including among other things three years' notice and a certain prescribed majority vote. Article VIII provides:

"No person shall be ordained and consecrated Bishop or ordered Priest or Deacon unless at the time in the presence of the ordaining Bishop or Bishops he shall subscribe and make the following declaration:

"I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God and to contain all things necessary to salvation: and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, discipline and wor-

ship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.' ”

Article XI provides as follows:

“No alteration or amendment of this constitution shall be made unless the same shall be first proposed at one triennial meeting of the General Convention and by a resolve thereof be sent to the Secretary of the Convention of every diocese to be made known to the Diocesan Convention at its next meeting and be adopted by the General Convention at its next succeeding triennial meeting by a majority of the whole number of Bishops entitled to vote in the House of Bishops and by a majority of the Clerical and Lay Deputies of all the dioceses entitled to representation in the House of Deputies, voting by orders.”

The proposed canon purports to confer upon the Bishops the power to confirm and ordain sectarian clergymen who are not at the time to sign the declaration of conformity required by Article VIII. This is impossible. Article VIII limits the power of ordination to candidates who *at the time of ordination* subscribe the declaration to conform. This limitation if it can be removed, can be removed only by an amendment to the Constitution. The proposed canon is not and does not purport to be such an amendment. An amendment would require three years' notice which admittedly has not been given and could be adopted only by a vote quite different from that required to enact a canon.

The power to ordain cannot be exercised by bishops on their own terms and of their own motion. It is subject to control by the Church, as the Proposers obviously admit in introducing their enabling canon. But the Church has already fixed the terms and these can be altered only by amendment to the Constitution. Were Article VIII the

only provision of the Constitution it would be fatal, but there are other provisions of equal efficiency and of greater substance, going to the merits and based upon the nature of things. A consideration of these becomes important.

III.

The union or approach towards union sought to be created in form with sectarian bodies, the transaction of ordination⁴ sought to be established, the rite and ceremony of the administration of the Holy Communion sought to be authorized, and the intercommunion sought to be sanctioned are incongruous with the life and being of the Protestant Episcopal Church, contrary to its fundamental law, destructive of its personality, in conflict with its Constitution as a whole and in utter violation of Article X itself.

Article X of the Constitution provides that "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons, the Form of Consecration of a Church or Chapel, the Office of Institution of Ministers, and Articles of Religion as now established or hereafter amended by the authority of this Church shall be in use in all the Dioceses and Missionary Districts of this Church." Article X then forbids any alteration thereof or addition thereto except by the same majority votes in both houses of the General Convention, on the same three years' notice and other formalities precisely as prescribed for an amendment to the Constitution in Article VIII, *vide supra*, except that there

⁴ This is the expression used by the Apologist in the June number of this magazine, p. 846.

is a special requirement that notice is to be sent by resolve of the General Convention to the Secretary of the Convention of every Diocese *within six months*.

Thus the Prayer Book and its Formularies, with all that they express and all that they necessarily imply are made a part of the fundamental Law and incorporated in the bed-rock of the Constitution of the Church, alterable so far as they are alterable only by a constitutional amendment.

The written Constitution definitely expresses the doctrine of the Episcopate and its essential connection through the required laying on of hands with a valid laity and a valid priesthood and hence with a valid administration of the Holy Communion. The Proposals we submit are in direct conflict with it. This doctrine is of the personality of the Protestant Episcopal Church and when it perishes that personality expires. It is part of the fundamental faith and that, as we have pointed out, does not owe its origin to the written provisions of the Constitution. It existed before the Constitution was enacted, and had its being before the Corporation was created. That it is expressed in the Prayer Book and Formularies and by their adoption into the Constitution is given definite form and expression there adds nothing to its reality, to its sanctity or to its necessity. The power to amend the Constitution of this religious corporation as expressed in Section X and Section XI does not extend to an amendment which purports to invade or impair the fundamental faith which the corporation embodies. That would be null and void as contrary to the nature of things. The right to destroy personality in a religious corporation does not exist and any attempt to confer it is null and void. It is true that some members of the Protestant Episcopal Church may claim that this doctrine is not their doctrine and may construe the expressions of the

Prayer Book and the Formularies and deal with their vast and invincible implications regardless of it. Even a powerful majority may do this. But a majority under a constitution does not determine a right against the provisions of that constitution. Constitutions are made to protect the rights of minorities. The direct expressions and the invincible implications of the Constitution guarantee the recognition of certain truths dearly bought and tenaciously held. It does not lie with any majority to say they are not important. They are in the Constitution, to say nothing of the Fundamental Faith. That alone makes them important and gives even to a feeble minority the right to their recognition and enforcement. Among these truths is the doctrine of the Episcopate with its essential connection, through the required laying on of hands, with a valid laity, a valid priesthood and a valid sacrament. Claims may be asserted *pro* and *con*. Determination will be found only in the application of that principle of the civil law which recognizes the personality—the soul of a religious corporation—as something above corporate form and expression and as safeguarded by the secular law from destruction by the act of a majority.

It is obvious that the Constitution prescribes a definite instruction for the laity before they enter into relation with the Church as communicants, and that it also requires a definite act between each lay member and a bishop in which act is involved expression of assent to articles of faith.

“A catechism that is to say an instruction to be learned by every person to be brought to be confirmed.”

“The order of confirmation or laying on of hands upon those who are baptized and come to years of discretion.”

“Then all of them in order kneeling before the Bish-

op, he shall lay his hands upon the head of every one severally."

So as to the Communion Office. Expressions of faith therein, by act and word, of guarantees of faith—such as the recognition of the priestly office, the confession, the absolution, the invocation, the oblation, the rites and ceremonies of consecration and of receiving the elements, all guarantees of faith and belief, cannot be reduced or changed without violation of the Constitution.⁵ So as to the Ordination Office. Under the Proposed Canon with its strange silence on the constitutional form of ordination important tests of the Constitution touching the candidate may be dispensed with. In its initiation and in its consummation the taking of Orders may become a sort of private transaction between a bishop assisted by a standing committee on one side and the candidate on the other. The safeguard of the public witness of the Church is gone. The safeguards of compulsory rites and ceremonies, of acts of faith designed to express assent to articles of faith through open, visible, audible participation are gone. These safeguards are of the very essence of the constitution and inherent right. The Apologist for the Proposals is on record in support of this claim. That "forms safeguard rights" is the principle earnestly contended for by him in his report as Chancellor of the Diocese of New York in 1917. He said:

"Canonical procedure, like all other legal procedure is often described, by those who are insensible of the importance of form, as mere technicality. It is not that. Forms are the prescribed method of discharg-

⁵ The Proposers seem to consider these negligible matters. Their Apologist (p. 842 and 848) dismisses them with no other claim than that "Churchmen attach great value to them." This is true and the Constitution makes them indispensable.

ing official duties. Where they are not observed either the duty is neglected or else the prescribed evidence of its performance is lacking and it cannot be known whether it has been performed or not. Forms safeguard rights."

Yet in spite of these assertions their author as Apologist for the Proposals urges upon us a step that cannot be accomplished except through a disregard of forms in Confirmation, in Ordination and in Holy Communion, forms that safeguard the rights of the entire Church and thereby safeguard the Faith.

No claim has been made that the constitutional order of Ordination is to be used or observed and there is a frank disclaimer of the use of the Communion Office as prescribed in the Constitution.

The Proposed Canon by providing certain things that shall be done in the "transaction of ordination" excludes by implication other matters provided for in the Prayer Book order. By that order the candidate is compelled to declare that he will "minister the doctrine and sacraments as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church hath received the same." The Proposed Canon requires of him nothing touching the Holy Communion save that he will invariably use the elements of bread and wine, the words and acts of our Lord in the Institution, the Lord's Prayer and either of the Creeds. Is this ministering this sacrament "as the Church hath received the same" when by her Constitution she sets forth an order and rites and ceremonies of the Communion Office which signify and express much more?

The Prayer Book order of Ordination provides that the candidate shall pledge himself "to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines con-

trary to God's Word." The Proposed Canon requires no such pledge. This pledge means nothing else than erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word as interpreted by and expressed in the Constitution of the Church. It will be remembered that this Church in the Ordination Office asserts that the "doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded" and "according to the commandments of God" are "as this Church hath received the same." Yet the Proposed Canon would authorize without observation of the safeguards provided by the Constitution the ordaining of sectarian clergymen to administer the sacraments to congregations without observation of the same safeguards touching doctrines that are erroneous and strange and contrary to God's Word as expressed in the said Constitution and to accommodate which strange and erroneous doctrines they and their ministers by the Proposed Canon will be remitted and dispensed from the rites and ceremonies prescribed by the said Constitution in Ordination, in Confirmation, in Holy Communion. Is this driving away strange and erroneous doctrines? Is it not a violation of constitutional law? A consideration of the Prayer Book along the lines suggested in connection with the Proposed Canon will reveal many other instances of such violation. Indeed, the moment the Prayer Book is regarded as a part of its Constitution, as the Church decrees it to be, the Proposed Canon falls to the ground as Uzzah fell when he put forth his hand and touched the Ark of the Covenant.

Any proposition to amend the Constitution in all necessary points to accommodate the Proposed Canon is impossible. The power to amend resides, as a matter of form and jurisdiction, in General Convention, but it is obvious that its exercise would be fatal. After the amendment had

eliminated the Prayer Book, altered the Rites and Ceremonies and emasculated the form of the Sacraments so as to secure the accommodation there would be nothing left. Suicide has sometimes been defended but its advocates have never maintained that it did not destroy life. If such accommodating amendment is attempted, even though the power to amend expressed in Articles X and XI is invoked to sustain it and the formalities duly observed, the destruction of the personality of the religious corporation, The Protestant Episcopal Church, will have been accomplished. Decay of Faith will have touched the centre of life. The legal franchise may continue, the corporate form may be there, the Constitution may read as it will, but beneath the form is Death. The amendatory clauses of a constitution may be invoked to sustain but not to destroy that personality, that "*inherent spontaneity of life which is not imposed but original, which though it may be regulated by the civil authority is not derived therefrom.*"⁶

IV.

We have now to consider the principle of identity or personality in a religious corporation. It is involved with another principle—the principle of development. Their reconciliation is sometimes difficult, usually because that which is called development is in reality decay. We have appealed to the principle of identity or personality. The

⁶ We quote the vigorous language of the lamented Father Figgis in "Churches in the Modern State." With the argument of Father Figgis we do not agree and we submit it is not difficult to discern its fundamental error in view of the Proposals. Father Figgis would seem to have overlooked in his argument that the greatest danger to a religious corporation is not from oppression by the civil power but from the destructive and unlawful acts of a majority within, and that against this menace there is no material power to be invoked except the secular courts.

Proposers, it is understood, appeal to the principle of development. It will be our purpose to examine and see what light the Law throws on the issue when the two principles are said to conflict.

The validity of the principle of development may be conceded and its application in a given case may be disputed. The minds of the members of a religious corporation may change in respect to its fundamental belief. If such change extended throughout the membership death as we have shown would result. If it affects only a part of the membership that part, even if a majority, may be restrained from acts violative of the corporate life. Where there is a written constitution expressing the fundamental faith in definite articles, even if the constitution provide for amendment, amendment cannot be carried out to the destruction of the fundamental faith, the personality of the religious corporation. The Proposed Canon does not purport to amend the Constitution and is therefore obviously powerless. But it is possible that the Proposed Canon may be converted at some time into an amendment to the Constitution and even that other proposals may be made purporting to further amend it in order to accommodate changes in the views of different groups within the Church. The question opens up rather profound considerations beyond the province of this article, but we may briefly consider it through the medium of the decision of the Justices of the House of Lords in "the Free Church of Scotland Appeal."⁷ In that case a part of the religious society known as The Free Church of Scotland by a majority

⁷ General Assembly of Free Church of Scotland Appellant versus Lord Overton and others Respondents. The Law Reports, House of Lords Cases. 1904 Appeal Cases, p. 515.

vote had established a union with the religious society known as The United Presbyterian Church. The union was to be known as The United Free Church of Scotland. The minority of The Free Church of Scotland appealed to the secular courts for the protection of its rights and the restitution of the Church property to it as constituting although a mere minority "The Free Church of Scotland." They based their claim upon the ground that The Free Church of Scotland held to the Establishment principle and the unqualified acceptance of the Westminster Confession of Faith and they asserted that the principle and the formulary were part of the Constitution of the Church and could not be altered. There appears to have been no formal constitution. The United Presbyterian Church with whom the majority of The Free Church of Scotland had assumed to unite stood for Disestablishment and for a lax adherence to the Westminster Confession. The Court held the union in violation of the fundamental faith of The Free Church of Scotland and incongruous and void, rejected the doctrine of development and awarded the church properties to the dissentient minority. There is very little if anything in the opinion of the Justices to show that their conclusions would have been different had The Free Church of Scotland possessed an express provision for "amendment." A clear expression of the theory guiding the Court in its momentous decision is found in the following words of one of the Justices, the Earl of Halsbury:⁸

"It is not the case of two associated bodies of Christians in complete harmony as to their doctrine agreeing to share their funds but two bodies each agreeing to keep their separate religious views where they dif-

⁸ The Report, p. 627.

fer, agreeing to make their formularies so elastic as to admit those who accept them according as their respective consciences will permit.

“Assuming, as I do, that there are differences of belief between them, these differences are not to be got rid of by their agreeing to say nothing about them, nor are their essentially diverse views avoided by selecting so elastic a formulary as can be accepted by people who differ and say that they claim their liberty to retain their differences while purporting to join in one Christian Church.

“It becomes but a colourable union, and no trust fund devoted to one form of faith can be shared by another communion simply because they say in effect there are some parts of this or that confession which we will agree not to discuss and we will make our formularies such that either of us can accept it. Such an agreement would not, in my view, constitute a Church at all, or it would be, to use Sir William Smith’s phrase, a Church without a religion. Its formularies would be designed not to be a confession of faith, but a concealment of such part of the faith as constituted an impediment to the union.”⁹

The decision of the Court by a vote of five to two seems to involve the rejection of the principle of development in the law of Religious Corporations. It further seems to hold in favor of the view that in the nature of things a church corporation cannot by action of a majority change the essential foundations of faith on which the church in its origin planted itself—cannot amend away “the unwritten Charter of its foundation.” It further seems to hold that even the express power to amend constitutional limita-

⁹ Other expressions by the Justices especially applicable in the case of the Proposals will be found in the words of Lord Robertson, pp. 668 and 675. Lord James, pp. 656 and 664.

tions and formularies cannot be stretched to the point of covering such destruction. The decision rests upon the law of trusts and the instant aversion of a court to wink at a breach of trust. The court recognized expressly that many lives had been devotedly sacrificed to build up the great Free Church of Scotland in her identity as revealed by her fundamental standards, that a vast treasure of money and of land had been consecrated to her in that identity. When a triumphant majority attempted to change that identity and to appropriate the fruit of those lives and those gifts as against a dissentient (almost negligible) minority, the Court, true to the constancy of the Common Law put forth an arresting hand and restored all to the minority as The Free Church of Scotland in its original identity. It is easy to see what a crisis may arise if the power to amend the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church shall be used even by a majority to change the fundamental standards of faith until identity is lost. If the power to amend is pushed to the limit the principles enunciated in The Free Church of Scotland may be successfully invoked.

V.

The views of the Proposers have been in a measure set forth in the Statement to the Proposed Canon and have been elaborated in the Apology. An examination of these will, it is believed, be illuminating.

At page 836 of the June number of this magazine the author of the Apology says:

“There is a general and widespread desire that in some way all the separated groups or churches should reunite in one universal church and so fulfil the will of their Master.”

Unity then is the necessary condition of the organic life of the Church—the Will of the Church's Master—the Mind of Christ. But what is unity? The Apologist refrains from defining it and this, we submit, is a fatal omission. He says at page 837:

“It is therefore reasonable not to define overmuch but to look for marks of unity with regard to which we can feel no doubt, and when we find them, if nothing else appear to be indispensable, we do well to be satisfied. Of such marks there are three which are universally acknowledged: the marks of Common Faith, Common Worship, Common Order.”

But these are mere marks and marks are not unity. Something else does appear to be indispensable. The Apologist himself tells us that the pre-Reformation Church—that society which he describes (p. 835) as “majestic in its origin and its power, unique in its extent, splendid in the continuity of its saints, a witness and a monument without parallel in human experience,” and which he claims and we all know had his three marks of unity,—fell in spite of them, shattered into disunity for the lack of that indispensable something. Never were the Creeds, the Eucharist and the Ministry, as marks, more universal and more impressive than in the Pontificate of Leo X, yet the vast structure of the Western Church fell apart in disunity for the lack of that indispensable something. And the Apologist admits it. He speaks (p. 835) of the distinction between “true and worthy believers” and others.

“On this distinction,” he says, “great emphasis was laid by many of the Reformers who felt that the Visible Church through its corruption in faith and morals had lost its competency and forfeited its privilege to bear witness to Christ, and who called upon true be-

lievers to come out of it. These were the faithful elect, the invisible Church, and they manifested their spiritual integrity by coming out."

The indispensable something then according to the Apologist himself is integrity of faith.

Can the Church be asked to approach the situation to be developed under the Proposed Canon because it bears *marks* of unity when on the Apologist's own showing it is void of fundamental guarantees of an underlying integrity of faith, and consequently of all promise of unity; and when by the same showing the situation involves an "approach to unity" by the Protestant Episcopal Church with other bodies that in their origin, their history, and their propaganda are, according to the Protestant Episcopal Church, characterized by positive corruption of faith. Unity is impossible because of contradiction touching an essential element of faith. There cannot in the nature of things be an approach for it would be and is an approach to the impossible. As we shall see from the Proposers' Statement (*in-fra*) they assume that the laying on of hands by the Episcopate while necessary to a valid ministry is not essential to a valid laity. But this is not the point. The Constitution and the Fundamental Faith say it is essential. We are reminded that the Episcopate is not necessary to individual salvation or to a Christian life. The Apologist speaks at page 847 of the insult to assume that Congregationalists "are anything else than a body of sincere Christian people, as sincere in their love of God and their desire to do His will as any congregation of our own people." All that is here claimed may be instantly and cordially granted. Mary Slessor of Calibar and St. Catherine of Sienna shine in individual spirituality—and in the conduct of the individual Christian life with convincing light. An individual

may in the providence of God find salvation alone, outside of any visible church or organized body, but he cannot participate in the work of saving the human race by a worldwide, unified organization, the ultimate, visible Catholic Church, nor if he persists in standing alone can he participate in the means of grace provided by the same, in accordance with what the Protestant Episcopal Church and all that is Catholic in history has always professed to believe to be—the Mind of Christ. Did Christ intend the Episcopal Order or did He not? The Protestant Episcopal Church says He did. The Congregational Church says He did not, and the views are respectively a part of the faith of each in its integrity.

The Proposers say in their statement that the Episcopate “in the greater part of Christendom” is such that “the members of the Protestant Episcopal Churches ought not to be expected to abandon it in assenting to any basis of reunion,” but the statement is silent as to its being of such importance that sectarian congregations should be expected to embrace it or come to any assent to it beyond the mere toleration involved in their permission to their ministers to go through a “transaction of ordination.”

“We have not discussed the origin of the Episcopate historically, or its authority doctrinally,” says the Statement. But is not such discussion imperative?

“No Christian community is involved in the necessity of disowning its past,” says the Statement. Are Calvinists involved in the necessity of disowning the burning of Servetus? Shall Anglicans disown a corrupt and tormenting alliance with the English State, or the rejection and persecution of John Wesley? Shall Roman Catholics disown the Inquisition, and the corruption of the Papacy? Are the doctrines of “Justification by Faith Only,” of Erastianism,

of Unitarianism, of Infallibility to be disowned? What do the Proposers mean? At Easter in the present year an eminent Congregational divine, for many years the pastor of the leading Congregational church, published an editorial on Easter and the Resurrection in which a parallel was carefully drawn between Abraham Lincoln and Jesus Christ. The widening influences of each were treated as identical in kind. No one could read without seeing that the writer, with commendable frankness, intended should be seen—a denial of the miraculous Christ of the Catholic faith—a relegation of Jesus Christ and Abraham Lincoln to the same order of being. Would this characterize a past that in the opinion of the proposers “need not be disowned”?

“In conferring or accepting such ordination,” says the Statement, “neither the bishop ordaining nor the minister ordained should be understood to impugn thereby the efficacy of the minister’s previous ministry.” Would a previous ministry characterized by the views expressed by the minister whose editorial we refer to be one that ordination by a Protestant Episcopal bishop should be held not to impugn?

“The sense or intention,” says the Statement, “in which any particular order of the ministry is conferred or accepted is the sense or intention in which it is held in the Universal Church.” But what is that sense? The Protestant Episcopal Church says it is one sense. The Congregational says it is another. The difference of sense led to the genesis of the Congregational Society. Can the two bodies be reconciled by an “approach towards unity,” through a mere “transaction of ordination,” while the difference in faith continues?

“In the army and navy,” says the Statement, “chaplains so ordained could minister acceptably to the adherents of

Christian bodies who feel compunctions about the regularity of non-episcopal ministry." It is more than a crime to let "compunctions" divide the Church. If the basis of the Episcopate is "*compunctions*" let us abolish the Episcopate. That would be at least a rational step toward unity. Why should anyone be asked to respect "*compunctions*"? Respect is reserved for convictions.

The Proposers seem at times to falter strangely between conflicting views. Thus their Apologist at page 842 says:

"Care is taken not to require the ordained minister to impose upon them (his people) any particular forms which in the beginning might be uncongenial (*sic*) and might tend to drive them away from, rather than attract them towards unity of the Church. Upon this point as upon others Churchmen who believe in the verity of the Anglican liturgical type ought to have confidence that in time it will approve itself to those who, where the English language prevails, shall desire to worship in unity with Christians of the Anglican Communion."

Now this argument of a possible liturgical unity follows on a showing that the sectarian congregations in the Approach are to be remitted and dispensed from liturgical requirements—because they might be "uncongenial" and "drive" people away. They are to retain their own non-liturgical type of worship outside of the Communion Office and all that is liturgical in that may be deleted. How in all seriousness can the Apologist predicate a liturgical development on these premises? But assuming that by some miracle such a development does take place, it is in itself of no value. Things liturgical and confidence in them were supreme in that same Pontificate of Leo X but they did not hold the Church together in the absence of integrity of faith.

There is something almost naive, if not arrogant, in the assumption that the Proposed Canon in bringing the Protestant Episcopal body and the sectarian bodies into an "Approach towards Unity" will necessarily promote a "Catholic" development. Why, in justice to the past of the Congregational Churches which they are "not to disown," to their fidelity to the truth as they have seen it, and to their honest zeal in propagating it, may we not generously concede at least the possibility of a "Congregational" development?

Touching Confirmation, the Apologist (p. 848) says:

"We do not regard Confirmation as a barrier to keep people away from Communion but as a help to its worthy reception. If others find this help in other ways which owing to, let us say, the imperfections of the system in which they have been brought up, they deem sufficient, is it the duty of a priest of the Catholic Church to exclude them from the altar, when they seek the Lord's presence because he believes they might have received, had they been members of this Church, more effective grace than he supposes they have received?"

The answer to this question is that what "they deem sufficient" is not the question nor what some priest casually believes or supposes, but what the Fundamental Faith as well as the written Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church require. Further, if the "help to the worthy reception" of the Holy Communion provided by such Faith and such Constitution may be found, as the Apologist says, "in the imperfections" of other systems, then why contend for the Protestant Episcopal Church? Why not avail of such efficient "imperfections"? To find "help in imperfections" is a bewildering process and one we submit that is unknown alike to law, to theology and to logic. If as the Apologist

claims, preferences for the Sacrament as administered in the Protestant Episcopal Church but without confirmation should be regarded and provided for, why should not the preferences of many worthy people for such Sacrament without consecration be regarded and provided for? We appeal to the Apologist's principle in his report as Chancellor: "Forms safeguard rights." If they safeguard them in the form of Episcopal Consecration, and the Apologist has said that they do, do they safeguard them any the less in the form of Confirmation? Is the consecration of a single bishop of greater importance than the confirmation of all the laity? Is there any meaning in the one without the other? Can the arch span the nave after the foundation stones are removed?

That integrity of faith may be wholly lost just at this point is clearly indicated in the argument of the Apologist. He himself points out the lack of any demand for an expression of guaranty of intention in the sectarian congregations sufficient in the Catholic sense to sustain the validity of the "transaction of ordination" and the subsequent ministrations and proceedings of the ministers and congregations. He attempts to meet the point, page 847, where he says:

"In the next place their adherence to the Catholic faith is guaranteed. This Church requires no other assurance on that head from its own people, than the confession of the Catholic Creeds."

In the next paragraph, page 847, he continues:

"Some one may say, that we cannot know that the congregation in general, or any member in particular, confesses the faith in the Catholic sense. Quite true, we cannot. But the Church does not ask this question

of our own communicants." And again, page 848, "The sense and intention with which they (the Sacraments) are celebrated are exhibited in the matter and the form; and the Church does not ask the individual worshipper what he means by these things."

It is at least not convincing to be told that the adherence of the congregation to the Catholic faith is guaranteed and then to be told on the same page that we cannot know that the congregation in general or any member in particular confesses the faith in the Catholic sense.

But the Protestant Episcopal Church as we have shown does require further assurance of Catholic faith than the confession of the Creeds, does ask whether its members confess the Faith in the Catholic sense and does ask the individual worshipper "what he means by these things." Eucharistic memories crowd upon the mind in the face of the Apologist's words — the insistence of that service on the priestly office as distinct from the ministerial office — the requirement that the priest kneel down at the Lord's Table—that he take the Paten into his hand—that he lay his hand on all the bread — that he lay his hand upon every vessel in which there is any wine to be consecrated — that every communicant receive the elements devoutly kneeling — that with the giving of the Bread the priest declare the words "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ" — that after communion he reverently place upon the Lord's Table what remaineth of the consecrated elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth. — And yet we are told that the Church does not ask the individual worshipper what he means. What a monstrous assertion! She questions him with a painful persistency and compels her members to answer by word, by posture, by rite and ceremony unalterably inscribed in her Constitution.

Does the Apologist contend that the members of his Church comply with all this and mean nothing by it? Does he seek a refuge in the claim that because some of them may be merely present at this rite and are not compelled by beadle or vergers to speak out their assent, therefore the Church does not consider that they assent? At page 847 he asserts that silent participation in a rite signifies assent to it. It is a well known principle. Is it because of this principle that the Proposed Canon is drawn so as to authorize administration by episcopally ordained ministers to sectarians, of the Holy Communion without the rites and ceremonies prescribed by the Protestant Episcopal Constitution? Silent participation signifies assent — therefore the rite is emasculated of features participation in which though silent might be thought to express assent to unacceptable doctrines of the Catholic Faith or the renunciation of heresies tenaciously held.

It is unhappily true that the Protestant Episcopal body like all religious bodies has a considerable membership, priests and laymen, disobedient in their conduct and indifferent or sceptical touching their faith. But it is as impossible to determine the standards of a church by her derelicts as it is to gauge a ship's burthen by the incrustation of barnacles.

It would seem then to come to this: An assent to integrity of faith is to be dispensed with on the ground that the Protestant Episcopal Church asks no questions of its members concerning it. We submit the invalidity of this ground has been demonstrated. The essentials in respect to the Episcopate it is proposed to get over or around by dissecting it from the laity—extirpating the idea of Apostolic Succession — and converting it partly into a mere historical ornament, — pretty but not essential, — and

partly into a mere mechanical device — convenient but not sacrosanct, almost as remote from the Episcopate of Integrity of Faith as the church-sexton or the bell-ringer, so that as far as the congregation coming into a possible connection with the Episcopate as a means of grace is concerned, it is asked to change nothing, to become nothing, to do nothing. The argument proceeds upon the theory of a bishop validly consecrated, a minister formally ordained, and of a congregation without Catholic faith, and without Catholic intent. This would seem to the lay mind something like a church without a laity.

In the Proposals is surely contained the seeds of increased disorder and confusion. They are premonitory of a crumbling in integrity of faith. It was that same Leo X who ushered in the age of schism with the declaration, privately made, that the divine order of the Church was a fable. Is there more than a difference of degree, excepting in good intentions, between the conclusion of Leo and the Proposals,—between the total relegation of the Episcopate to the fabulous and its accommodating attenuation? In each case, is there not an impairment of that Integrity of Faith which, and which alone, is Unity? Will not that which was true in 1519 prove true in 1919?

No one can or will dispute the gravity of the sin of disunity or the nobility and sincerity of the intention of the Proposers. That intention is nowhere here impugned. But integrity of faith is a price that cannot be paid for good intentions. "The duty of Christian unity must give way to the more imperious duty of Christian fidelity to truth."¹⁰ The bedrock of the Constitution of the Church,

¹⁰ The words of Lord Justice Robertson in *The Free Church of Scotland Appeals*, p. 675.

“The doctrine and Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church hath received the same” can in no wise be surrendered to accommodate doubt on essential points. “Thou art Peter and on this Rock I will build my Church.” No conglomerate will answer though in size it may outbulk the world.

The Council and Creed of Nicaea

BY THE REV. WILLIAM S. BISHOP, D.D.

IN these eventful days the eyes and thoughts of the world are being turned more and more towards Constantinople—the city of the first Christian ruler of the Roman Empire—and towards its magnificent basilica of St. Sophia, erected fourteen hundred years ago by Constantine’s successor Justinian in honor of that Divine and eternal Wisdom which is but another name for the incarnate Son of God. Linked in indissoluble connection with the city and the church is that great ecumenical Creed which is received and acknowledged by all who recognize in Christ the eternal Light and the incarnate Wisdom. City, Church and Creed,—it is impossible to dissociate any one of these from the rest. Even though the Creed was framed before the city of Constantine was built, and in a town some seventy miles distant, yet the Creed of Nicaea is inseparably associated with Constantine’s city and with all the varying fortunes of its long history.

As for the city of Constantinople today, its symbolic and representative character, as standing for the ideal of a Christian world-empire, is becoming more and more apparent. The Bishop of Edinburgh has recently said:

“The other capitals of Europe seem by her side to be things of yesterday, creations of accident. Some chance a few centuries ago made them seats of government till some other chance may make them cease to be seats of government. But the City of Constantinople abides and must abide. Over and over again has that city prolonged the duration of powers which must otherwise have crumbled away. In the hands of the Roman, Frank, Greek and Turk her inspired mission has never left her. The eternity of the elder Rome is the eternity of moral influence; the eternity of the younger Rome is the eternity of a city and fortress fixed on a spot which Nature herself had destined to be the seat of the empire of two worlds. What are these two worlds? Those of the East and West. What will bind them together? Surely, the League of Nations. . . . There, in the Teheragan Serai, the most wonderful palace in the world, might sit the parliament of nations, the international court that shall keep guard over the world’s peace.”

And in the grand basilica of St. Sophia—the “Holy Wisdom”—the Christian faith as embodied in the Nicene Creed finds its fitting outward counterpart and expression. It may well be questioned whether any Church in Christendom makes a more universally compelling appeal to Christian thought than does the great Church of Justinian, who is said to have exclaimed upon its completion, “Solomon, I have surpassed thee.” The splendors of architecture and of pictorial art united to glorify the fane of the heavenly “Wisdom.” It was the splendor of Divine worship as conducted in this church in accordance with the Greek ritual which impressed the delegates from pagan Russia with the feeling that they were being permitted a glimpse, as it were, of the worship of heaven itself. And the result was the conversion of Russia to the Christian faith. Beneath that

same lofty dome Latin and Greek Christianity met in anti-christian conflict. It was upon the high altar of St. Sophia (July 16, 1054) that the Papal Legates laid the letter which excommunicated the Greek patriarch Michael Cerularius. For many years the church was abandoned by the Greeks on account of the "desecration" of its altar by the offering thereon of unleavened bread in the Latin Mass.

An interesting legend connects itself with the capture of Constantinople and the seizure of its great basilica by the Turkish invaders in A. D. 1453. The story runs that at the close of mass the celebrant, bearing the sacred vessels, disappeared through a side door into some hidden chamber, and that his Moslem pursuers were never able to find either him or the instruments of the Christian sacrifice. The mosaics of saints and prophets and especially that of the Christ seated in glory are still embedded in the walls of St. Sophia, indestructible so long as the building itself shall stand; though for many centuries they have been hidden from the sight of the Moslem worshippers by a thick coating of whitewash.

But it is in that historic symbol known as the "Nicene" Creed that the Christian history of Constantinople and of its great Church find its chief interpretation. As little Nicaea was taken up into the sphere of its imperial neighbor, and shared in the political life and fortunes of the Eastern capital, so the original Creed of A. D. 325 passed through a process of development and enlargement which is closely associated with the city of Constantine.

It was in Constantinople that the Second General Council met in A. D. 381, to seal the triumph of the faith to which the great Athanasius had devoted the toils and efforts of a long and romantically eventful life. In the words of Dean Stanley, "The first seven General Councils . . . were

as truly Eastern Councils, as truly the pride of the Eastern Church, as those of Constance and Trent are of the Western. Almost all were held within the neighborhood, most under the walls of Byzantium. All were swayed by the language, by the motives, by the feelings of the Eastern world.”* This Creed of Nicaea has come down to us as a part of our Christian and Catholic inheritance.

No doubt many of the worshippers in our churches have asked themselves the question, Why are there *two* Creeds in the Prayer Book, and why should two Creeds be said in the services of the Church? Our brethren of the Protestant bodies about us, if they use any Creed at all, make use of the Apostles’ Creed alone—that is, in public worship. A Presbyterian or a Methodist, if he were present at the service of the Holy Communion in one of our churches, might find himself rather at a loss to follow the recital of the Nicene Creed, which, though it follows in general the same outline as the Apostles’ Creed, yet has significant differences. For example, near the beginning is a long paragraph about the “One Lord, Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God,” which, in its language—though not in its substantial thought—would be unfamiliar to the average “evangelical” Protestant. In fact, the recital of the very first sentence of the Nicene Creed would be apt to throw him off the track:—“I believe in *one* God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, *and of all things, visible and invisible.*” “Why *two* Creeds,” he might say, “while the substance of the faith is undoubtedly the same?” It is not simply that one Creed has a longer and fuller explanation of certain articles than the other. This is, indeed, the case. The Nicene Creed does have a fuller account

* “History of the Eastern Church,” p. 18.

of each one of the three Divine Persons—the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost—than has the Apostles' Creed. This is true; but further than this—there is a *difference in standpoint* between these two Creeds, and a difference which is very illuminating. The difference between these two Symbols may be said to be not only quantitative but qualitative. The Apostles' Creed is the Creed of our Baptism—the Nicene Creed is the distinctive Creed of our Communion service. In a sense, the one may be called the individual Creed, the confession of the individual who is baptized and who makes acknowledgment of his own personal faith in the words, "I believe." One could wish that the original wording of the Nicene Creed might be restored in our Prayer Book, so that it might begin with the words, "*We* believe." For the Nicene Creed is the voice of the corporate Church; it is the common confession of the great society or Christian organism of which each one of us is but a tiny part. It is the Church speaking and not merely the individual; it is the collective voice of the corporate society—"We believe and confess." For this Creed was the expression of the whole Church through a General Council of her Bishops, and those Bishops spoke as the representatives of the entire Church, East and West. We know just when and where and how this Creed originated (I am speaking of its original form of A. D. 325). But we do not know just what was the history of the Apostles' Creed, or what were the steps by which it came into its present form. The fact, however, remains that as our Baptismal Creed reminds us of our individual responsibility as Christians, so the Nicene Creed as recited in the service of Holy Communion reminds us of our corporate unity as "one Body in Christ."

A further point of contrast between these two Creeds is seen in the fact that while one of them is Western and Latin the other is Greek and Eastern. The Roman Empire as St. Paul knew it, and as it was three centuries later in the days of Constantine, was a Graeco-Roman structure. Roman in its organization, it was in its culture predominantly Greek. We might almost say that while the *body* was Roman and Latin, the *soul* was Hellenic. Less than sixty years after the Emperor Constantine's death, the Empire was in fact divided into two parts, Eastern and Western, with Old Rome the capital—at least in point of honor and historic prestige—in the West, and Constantinople, the new city of Constantine, the capital in the East. Now the Apostles' Creed in its original form is what is referred to by scholars as the "old Roman Symbol," the one in use from earliest times in the Church at Rome; while the Nicene Creed takes its name from that city in Bithynia which lay opposite Byzantium or Constantinople, at a distance of only about seventy miles in a straight line. As we have seen, the whole atmosphere of those early Councils of the undivided Church was Greek. Greek was the language in which their discussions were carried on, and Greek was the language in which their decisions were registered. The soul, the atmosphere of the original Nicene Creed was Greek, and in a sense this Creed is still Greek today. But for this very reason the Creed is not provincial but cosmopolitan. Just because it is Greek in its philosophic grasp and insight, it is universal in its intellectual and spiritual appeal. It faces the intellectual problem connected with the Person of our Lord; it meets unflinchingly the question, "What *think* ye of Christ?"

In marked contrast the Apostles' Creed is short, terse and practical. It is Roman in its brevity and in confining

itself mainly to historic facts rather than intellectual speculation or definition.

And this leads directly to the great point of contrast as between the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. As the first may be called the Creed of our Lord's Humanity, so the other is pre-eminently the Creed of His Divinity. For what are more emphatically human facts than the facts of *birth* and *death*? It is distinctively human to be born and to die; "mortals" is but another name for human beings. Now it is the Apostles' Creed which speaks of the human birth and death of Jesus: "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; He suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead and buried." The Nicene Creed, on the other hand, makes no direct mention of our Lord's death. It says, "He suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures." No direct mention here of death; for the nature of the eternal Son of God is immortal and Divine. *Humanity* is susceptible of death, because the two elements which go to make it up, the soul and the body, may be separated. But no such experience can befall the Divine nature; it is unchangeable in its essential glory and in its immortal life. So, too, when we come to that other great human fact of *birth*, in connection with our Lord. It is His *human* birth of which the Apostles' Creed speaks: "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." But the birth of which the Nicene Creed testifies is Divine and eternal: "Begotten of His Father before all worlds, God from (or 'out of') God, Light from Light, very God from very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made." No direct reference here to the fact of human birth; although of course the human and physical birth of our Lord is plainly implied. But what we are to note is

that the Nicene Creed does not employ the word "birth" or "was born" in this connection. Were we to translate the Greek literally, it would read like this: "Who, for us men and for our salvation came down (from heaven) and was made flesh, or 'fleshified' (that is 'incarnate'), and was 'enmanned.'" That is to say,—the Eternal Son took on Him man's nature; metaphysically speaking, He *was humanized*. The only connection in which the words "birth" or "begetting" are used in the Nicene Creed is in reference to that Divine Birth which was from eternity,—“before all worlds.” Surely this suffices to place before us the Nicene and the Apostles' Creeds in their distinct and unmistakable contrast.

The contrast between these two Creeds as to their intellectual viewpoint is emphasized and reinforced in the light of their geographical and historical contrast. As the former is the Creed of Latin and Western Christendom, so the latter is pre-eminently the Creed of the Orthodox East. Think for a moment of the two world-capitals, the old Rome and the new. In marked contrast to the elder Rome, Constantinople was from its origin a Christian city, founded by Constantine to be the seat of a Christian Empire. And in accordance with its origin, Constantinople has been for the greater part of its long history a distinctively Christian city. The Turk has held possession of it, after all, for less than five out of its nearly sixteen centuries of existence. We may think of the two Romes as represented by the two great basilicas, St. Peter's, which symbolizes the Western or Roman Catholic Church, and St. Sophia, symbolizing the Eastern or Greek Catholic Church. "The Greeks seek after wisdom." St. Peter with his keys is the representative of ecclesiastical power and authority; but the holy and heavenly "Wisdom" to which the great temple of Eastern Chris-

tendom is dedicated is no other than Christ Himself, the Incarnate Word and Wisdom of the Father. It is He whose Divine and eternal origin is celebrated in the Nicene Creed, interpreting those wonderful opening words of St. John's Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." But while we have connected the Apostles' Creed more especially and immediately with the Church at Rome, and the Nicene Creed with the Church at Constantinople, yet it is never to be forgotten that each one of these great Symbols belongs to the *whole* Church; not merely to one or another section of the Church. These symbols of Christian unity are in substance accepted by all who believe and confess one Lord Jesus Christ—both God and Man.

Having spoken of the Creed of Nicaea, it remains that something be said of the Council which framed the Creed and of Athanasius, its great champion and defender. It was no brand-new symbol which was set forth by the great assembly of Bishops who met in Nicaea in the early summer of that year of our Lord 325. It was in its substance a venerable and time-honored Creed, the Creed which had been handed down in the Church of Caesarea, in Palestine. It was presented to the Council by Eusebius, the Bishop of that city. Some words, indeed, were new; they were added by way of explanation, to meet the novel and false teaching which had of late been propagated by Arius. Arius, a presbyter of the Church of Alexandria, a popular preacher and a keen and clever mind, but a man lacking in depth of spiritual faith and religious experience, had been teaching that since Christ is God's Son, and since a son is always younger than his father, that therefore God the Father is more ancient than Christ; in other words, that there was a time, in

the remote past ages, when the Son of God did not exist, was not yet born. This teaching appealed to many; they took it up and bandied it about in familiar talk and gossip, and in songs sung to popular tunes in the streets and market-places of Alexandria. Rebuked by his Bishop, Arius persisted in his rash and daring utterances. Finally, as the controversy grew and spread, it threatened to split the Church — which had preserved its unity through all the storms of Imperial persecution — and even promised to imperil the unity of the Empire, where Christianity had now at last become recognized as a *religio licita*, even as the religion distinctly favored by the Emperor. It was, therefore, in the interests of civil as well as of religious peace that Constantine now resolved to call this, the first General Council of the whole Church throughout the Roman Empire. Three hundred and eighteen bishops attended; of whom the great majority were from the East—from Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, Persia. In the West, Rome was represented, and North Africa, and Spain. From the North, beyond the Danube, came Theophilus the Goth, and there were even three bishops from distant Britain. The whole Christian, indeed, the whole civilized world was represented in that unique and unprecedented assembly. Truly it was no light matter upon which those men had been called together; it was no less a question than that concerning the Divine nature and the worship of Jesus Christ, for whose Name most of the bishops there present had suffered persecution. It has been said that “out of three hundred and eighteen, there were but a dozen who had not lost an eye or a hand, or who did not halt upon a leg shrunk in its sinew by the burning iron of torture.” From every point of view it was indeed a remarkable assembly. It came at a turning-point in the history of the Church. The Church had but

very recently emerged from the fires of the tenth and last of the great persecutions—that under Diocletian. And now the Christ who had in the persons of His servants overcome the bitter and prolonged opposition of the heathen world, was being assaulted in the house of His friends by those who denied His Divine nature as the Eternal Son of God.

It would be interesting to trace the journeyings of the bishops and presbyters as they came by land or by water to that central and accessible town of Nicaea. Dean Stanley gives an interesting account of the gathering in his "History of the Eastern Church." Each bishop was allowed transportation and accommodation in the inns along his route, or on board ship, if he came by sea; transportation and accommodation not only for himself but also for two attending presbyters and three slaves. Some rode on horseback, some on mules or donkeys. One bishop, James of Nisibis, was a hermit or cave-dweller, clad, like St. John the Baptist, in his rough cloak of goat's hair. A throne was set in the midst of the assembly for the Emperor, with a seat on either side for two distinguished bishops; one from the West—Hosius of Cordova, and the other—Eusebius of Caesarea—from the East. Constantine at his entrance into the assembly appeared regally clad in a robe of purple, worked with gold and embroidered with jewels. "His long golden hair was covered by a light helmet and encircled by a diadem." One of the attending bishops enthusiastically compared his appearance to that of an angel. Bishop Alexander, of the city of Alexandria in Egypt, was there, with his attendant, the Archdeacon Athanasius, then a young man, but afterwards destined not only to succeed Alexander as "Pope" of his see city, but to be the great champion of the Council and of its Creed.

Foremost among the problems confronting the Council was the question how the novel and soul-destroying heresy of Arius was to be met. It was in fact met, as we have already seen, not by the method of framing a new Creed, but by inserting in the old Creed certain test words and expressions which the Arian party could not and would not adopt. Only one of these need be mentioned here—and that the most important—the well-known phrase “of one substance with the Father.” This meant that the Divine Son was no mere “creature” of God, formed at a certain definite time and for a certain definite purpose—like other creatures—but that He was eternally begotten of the Father’s own being, and while personally distinct from the Father was at the same time essentially *one* with Him. For had not Christ said, “I and the Father are one,” and “he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father”? What does this mean if not that the Father and the Son are essentially but One Divine Being? But it was just this that the Arian party were not willing to admit. As a result they were condemned, anathematized and excluded from the fold of the Catholic Church. This meant a long battle, a battle lasting through many years and with many vicissitudes. Some of the Emperors who followed Constantine favored the Arian side, either out-and-out Arianism or a modified form of it. But Athanasius, who on the death of Alexander had become Bishop of Alexandria, was at once recognized and continued for more than a generation as the great champion of the Nicene faith. Persecuted, driven from his see, forced into exile, enduring all manner of trials and sufferings,—his life reads like a romance. Cardinal Newman in his “*Lyra Apostolica*” pays tribute to “royal-hearted Athanase,” an epithet which fitly expresses the

greatness of his character. And the historian Gibbon, himself not a lover of orthodox truth, "does justice to his position as high among the great men of history . . . and pronounces that 'his superiority of character and abilities would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy.'" It was indeed at one time "Athanasius against the world," during those days when Arians were patronized by the Emperor and the Imperial court. But finally the dauntless champion of the Nicene faith conquered, though he himself did not live to see the complete victory over Arianism. He died in the year 373, eight years before the Second General Council, which reaffirmed the Nicene faith. While Arius never was restored to the communion of the Church, Athanasius, "the father of orthodoxy," has always been honored, next to St. Paul and the other Apostles, as under God the witness and the champion of the Church's faith in her Divine Lord and Master. While it is true that the Nicene Creed is not *his* Creed—is not the Creed of any one man exclusively—yet it is not without significance that Athanasius is the only name which has become attached to a great Catholic Creed, that known as the *Symbolum Quicumque*. At the same time, Athanasius' name is more properly, as it is inseparably linked with the symbol of Nicaea. When we hear or recite it in Church, let us call to mind that great man, that saintly bishop and patriarch of Alexandria, sixteen centuries ago, who devoted his life to witnessing by word and deed—by his sufferings no less than by those immortal Orations of his against the Arians—to the central and fundamental truth of the God-head of Jesus Christ, his Lord and ours.

The Gospel According to St. John

BY THE REV. WALTER OVID KINSOLVING, A.M., B.D.

AS one approaches the works which adorn the walls of the great galleries of Europe, he has to start out with some information about the particular paintings which he plans to view. We have to consider the names, the nationalities, the abilities of the artists; the times in which they lived, the schools to which they belonged, the kinds of work in which they specialized, their purposes and aims. Then we look at the finished products. If we have trained eyes, or if we are properly guided, we may see there certain artistic merits. If we choose, we may be content with a contemplation of these, and may lose ourselves in admiration of the artists' mastery of paints. Or we may look still further, and may seek to enter, by means of the canvas, into some realm beyond—Nature, human life, the world of thought, the empire of pure fancy, the sphere of spiritual truth.

So, as we approach a book, we may consider first of all the facts about the author. We may then appreciate and meditate upon its literary merits. But most of us want to take one more step. We want to enter, by means of the written page, into some corner of human life, or into some fanciful and imaginative realm, or into some part of the intellectual and spiritual spheres. This is especially true when we take up a book of the Old or New Testaments. We are immeasurably grateful to the student and the scholar for their researches; but after we have listened to their conclusions we wish to find the writer's message about the things which pertain to salvation.

I refer the reader to the introductions to the New Testament, the commentaries, the treatises, the monographs, and the special articles for discussions concerning the authorship, the date, the sources, and the structure of the Fourth Gospel. We may safely believe that it was written towards the end of the first century by the Apostle John. Upon the Synoptic Gospels, as a foundation, the author seems to have built up his narrative. At least four processes appear to have been operative in the formation of the book: (1) elimination, (2) selection, (3) addition, (4) modification.

But upon what basis, and for what purpose, were the first three gospels so handled? In chapter xx, verses 30 and 31, we have the answer: "Many other signs, therefore, did Jesus in the presence of the disciples which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in His Name." We may recall in this connection the statement made by St. Clement of Alexandria (quoted in Eusebius' *H. E.* VI, xiv, 7): "John, perceiving that the bodily (or external) facts had been set forth in the other gospels, at the instance of his disciples, and with the inspiration of the Spirit, composed a spiritual gospel."

Were there, perhaps, some subsidiary aims and purposes? Some writers consider, with Mr. E. F. Scott, that there were certain "polemical" and "ecclesiastical" aims in the mind of the writer. They believe that the gospel was written (1) as a defense against the attacks which the Jews were making on Jesus and His teaching, (2) as a defense against a John the Baptist party within the Church, and (3) as a defense of the Faith against Docetism and Gnosticism. They claim also that the author, writing in a period when the Church was becoming more or less

fixed and stereotyped in form, with a fairly well defined body of doctrine, a sacramental system and a graded official Ministry, sought to bring out facts and truths in the life and teachings of the Master which bore upon the Church of the day, and which were especially calculated to help it. This purpose is thought to account for the emphasis on doctrine, on the two great sacraments and on the Ministry. It is doubtful, however, whether there was a strong John the Baptist party in existence in those times. It is very difficult to dogmatize about the relation of the Fourth Gospel to Gnosticism. And any "ecclesiastical" aim presupposes a very late date for the book.

It has been well said that "the dominant feature of any gospel is its conception of Jesus." Let us, then, consider the picture which this evangelist draws of the Master Himself.

The author introduces his narrative with a Prologue. He tells us:

1. That the Word of Logos existed eternally, from the beginning, before all worlds (i, 1. Cf. viii, 58; xvi, 28; xvii, 5).

2. That the Word, in that pre-existence, was *with*, or in some sense separate and distinct from, God, yet was truly God (i, 1).

3. That the Word created all things (i, 3).

4. That even before the Incarnation, when men did not receive the Light, the Word illuminated the world and men (i, 4-5). That is, there was a Divine Person Who was the self-revelation of God, of His Nature and of His Will, living and life-giving, in substance one with God, and also a perfect revelation, expression, and word of God Himself (Cf. i, 18).

When we read into the body of the gospel, we find that the Sonship of Jesus is "a standing theme" (Sanday, "Criticism of the Fourth Gospel"). Mr. Scott has declared (in his "The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Theology") that "the Son" or "the Son of God" is a name which belongs distinctively to Jesus in this book, and which "determines the whole Johannine conception of His nature and work." Dr. Sanday has collected some sixty separate verses which contain claims to Divine Sonship. It is possible that in some of these verses we have comments by the author. Certainly there are references to Jesus' Sonship which are made very obviously by the writer (for example: i, 14, 18; iii, 16, 18; xiii, 3; xii, 28).

Not only is the Master set before us in a very complete and striking manner as the Son of God, but even the term "Son of man" is brought into the narrative to set forth the glorification given to the Christ as the Divine Messiah, the God-Man (vid. iii, 13; vi, 62; i, 51; iii, 14; viii, 28; xii, 23; xiii, 31; vi, 27, 53; v, 27).

We return to the Prologue. The evangelist goes on to tell us:

1. That "the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth" (i, 14 a).

2. That "we beheld His glory, glory as of an only begotten of a Father" (i, 14 b, 9).

3. That He (i. e. the "true Light," the Word) came to those who were His own, and that they received Him not (i, 11).

4. That He gave to those who did receive Him, to those who believe on His Name, the right to become children of God (i, 12).

5. That such as do receive Him are born of God (i, 13).

The key to the evangelist's presentation of the Incarnate Life is to be found here, in these statements.

Passing over the birth, the infancy, and the youth of Jesus, St. John comes at once to His ministry to those who were "His own." "He came unto His own." This gospel tells us about an early ministry to Judea and Jerusalem. This account is both unique and significant. It is unique in that it is found only in this book. It is significant in that it reveals the fact that the Divine Messiah came in the flesh first to the Chosen People. He came to transform the Hebrews into a new Israel. Through them He would have extended Life and Truth to the world. Such seems to be one of the essential and important teachings of the Fourth Gospel.

But "His own received Him not." In chapters i to iv the Light is depicted as shining into the world and upon men—a beacon and a challenge. In wonder and surprise souls look toward it. But almost at once there appear murmurings of hostility. The Jews asked for a sign (ii, 18). Nicodemus comes by night for information about the new Teacher (iii, 1 ff.). Jesus disregards the fact that many believe on His Name, and refuses to "trust Himself unto them." He is constantly revealing the moral attitude of the Jews—their absence of spiritual discernment and their lack of a sense of need for new life. In chapters v to vi is recorded a period of uncertainty (cf. especially vi, 30, 41, 52). In chapters vii to xii we see the progress of increasing hostility. The crisis comes in xi, 53, in the decision of the priests and Pharisees to put Jesus to death. The culmination follows, in xii, 36, in the departure of Jesus into hiding. The last 13 verses of this chapter are most significant, for they explain with some care the meaning of

events, and prepare the way for the Passion and Crucifixion.

During all of this period we see Jesus as the great Refiner of men. In response to many of the questions asked by the Jews, He delivers expository discourses. These do not teach ethical truth. They are declarations of the Christ's Divine Nature and of His mission among men. Thus they are challenges and tests for souls. As Jesus Himself expressed it, "If any man hear my sayings, and keep them not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my sayings, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I spake not from myself; but the Father which sent me, He hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (xii, 47-49). "For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through Him. He that believeth on Him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the Name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil" (xii, 17-18). So the Master put into operation a law of judgment which was almost automatic. The moment when a man deliberately rejects the revelation, at that moment he is judged and condemned—not by an arbitrary Divine decree, but by his own act in shutting the doors to life, and light, and truth.

Therefore, we are taught in this gospel, the worst sin is deliberate unbelief—or disbelief—wilful rejection of the revelation of God. Other types of sin are ignored (viii, 2-11, does not appear to be an original and integral part of

the book). Here, sin is fundamentally and essentially an act of rejection and of antagonism, resulting in a state of separation from God. It is spiritual darkness in the presence of light. It is ignorance of life. It is death (v, 24; viii, 21, 24).

The Synoptics fail to record the first mission to Israel. They present the subsequent founding of a new society in Galilee. They lay stress on the Master's efforts to build up a new spiritual Kingdom which is to embrace the world. They emphasize various aspects of sin. And they open a vision of the future and of the final Judgment.

Let us note how the words of the prologue continue to control St. John's presentation of the Incarnate Life. "As many as received Him," he goes on to say, "to them gave He the right to become children of God."

We think first of the power of faith. We "receive" Him by faith. The interested reader is referred to the following passages: iii, 16; 18; 36a; v, 24; vi, 29; vi, 35b; 40; viii, 24b; xi, 25-26; xii, 46; xiv, 12; xvi, 8-9. Belief is constantly set forth as the one great vital result of the Lord's work among men. Two other striking passages are xii, 47-48 and v, 24. Faith is the fundamental and essential element in the soul's reaction to God.

Another factor which is very important in the evangelist's eyes is love. There is emphasis both on love for God and on love for men. The motive and the standard of measure for both is Divine Love. We note especially: iii, 16; xv, 9; xiii, 34; xiv, 21, 23.

Yet faith and love are only means to an end. "Except a man be born anew (or from above)," Jesus declares to Nicodemus, "he cannot see the Kingdom of God" (iii, 3, and 5-6). The evangelist himself explains that those who receive Him and believe on His Name are "born not of

blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (i, 12-13). Again, we read: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have not life yourselves." Of course we may, if we choose, give to all three passages a purely subjective sense. But to a vast number of the most devout souls of Christendom they have always suggested the necessity of Baptism and of Sacramental Communion.

Let us ask now what this gospel teaches about this rebirth of God into life.

The term *Zoe* occurs thirty-four times in this book, whereas it is found but six times in St. Matthew, five times in St. Luke and three times in St. Mark. In seventeen passages it refers explicitly to eternal life. In other passages, either Divine life is referred to, or simply life. We note especially the following verses: v, 26; i, 4; iii, 36; v, 24; x, 10b; x, 28; vi, 47; vi, 53; vi, 57; vi, 68; xvii, 3. Here at least three great truths seem to be set forth. In the first place, "life" is spiritual contact and communion with the living God. In the second place, we find right here and now, in this world, this life in God. In the third place, we find therein a life which is eternal, and which will, for that reason, endure in an everlasting *Bios* in heaven.

As evidences of His power to give this "life," the Master performed miracles. The term which is characteristic of this gospel is *Semeion*, sign. Now a sign must signify something. And so we find that the five miracles narrated only in this book are all performed as signs of the Master's Divinity. The term *Ergon* is also used. It suggests one who, through his power, does something great and wonderful. It would be interesting to study here each miracle in detail, with a view to seeing how each wit-

nesses to the nature of Jesus as the Son of God. But I must be content with referring to the important circumstances in each case. In connection with the turning of water into wine, we note especially ii, 11. The healing of the nobleman's son at Capernaum is achieved after protest (iv, 48); but as a result the man "believed, and his whole house." The healing of the infirm man at the Pool of Bethesda becomes a text for a powerful sermon to the Jews (v, 17-47). The feeding of the five thousand causes "the people" to see in Jesus "the prophet that cometh into the world," and it also leads directly up to the great discourse on the Bread of Life. The healing of the man born blind is performed to "manifest" the "works of God." It results in the conversion of the man. It gives occasion for the parables of the Good Shepherd and of the sheepfold, and leads up to a very important dialogue with the Jews. The raising of Lazarus is for "the glory of God" and of "the Son of God." It strengthens the faith of Mary, and Martha, and the disciples, and converts many of the Jews. It also leads directly up to the final rejection of Jesus and to the determination to slay Him (xi, 46-53).

The miracles are very closely connected, in this gospel, with the selection and training of the disciples. The turning of water into wine causes His disciples to believe on Him. The feeding of the five thousand and the subsequent discourse are apparently intended to be decisive tests. And such they were—for after the discourse "many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him." The Twelve, however, still believe that He has "the words of eternal life," and remain loyal (with the exception, of course, of Judas). Then the evangelist depicts for us the last and crowning manifestation of the Master to His chosen ones,—in the farewell discourse of xiv, xv, and xvi,

in the intercessory prayer of xvii, in the washing of the feet of xiii, 1-20, and in the words of xiii, 31-34. In the farewell discourse He asserts anew His true Sonship and Divinity (xiv, 6b, 7-11, 20, 23b, 24, 31; xv, 1, 15b, 23, 24b; xvi, 3, 15a; 27-28; 32b; xiv, 6; xv, 1ff.; xiv, 28b; xvi, 5, 10, 28b; xvi, 33b), promises to them gifts of power from on high (xiv, 16-17, 26; xv, 26; xvi, 7b-11, 13-15; xiv, 18-20, 23; xvi, 16ff.; xiv, 12, 13-14; xv, 7, 16b; xvi, 23-24; 26-27; xiv, 2-4), tells them that He has chosen them purposely and for His love of them (xv, 9, 16), exhorts them to love one another (xv, 12-13, 17) and to be loyal to Him (xiv, 15, 21, 23-24; xv, 10, 14; xiv, 1, xv, 4ff., 9), prophecies separation and persecution (xv, 18ff.; xvi, 2-3, 32), and adds words of comfort and blessing (xiv, 27, 29; xv, 11; xvi, 1, 4ff, 20ff, 33). So St. John reveals to us how Jesus opened "life" to this little group of those who were to become His apostles.

As we might expect, the theme "of the giving of life" controls even the evangelist's presentation of the Atonement. "The Son of man" must be "lifted up," but only in order that "whosoever believeth may in Him have eternal life." Jesus regards His own Passion as His glorification. "And now, O Father," he prays, "glorify Thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (Cf. xii, 28). At the Last Supper He says: "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him; and God shall glorify him in himself, and straightway shall he glorify him." "Therefore doth my Father love Me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again." "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die it beareth much fruit." The evangelist declares that Jesus knew before the Passover that "the Father had given all things into His hands,

and that He came forth from God and goeth unto God." Caiaphas, said St. John, "prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that He might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad" (Cf. x, 16). If we may add these words, "that they might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing they might have life in His Name," we have in the two sentences an almost perfect statement of the significance of the death of Christ as set forth in this gospel.

After the Crucifixion, the Master Himself and the Father will both come again into the world (xiv, 3, 18, 20, 23; xvi, 16). But the Holy Ghost will also come, for the special work of sanctification and the giving of life. The Son will pray the Father, and He will send to the Twelve this Comforter, to be with them forever. He will be *in* them. He will teach them all things, will guide them into all truth. For He "shall not speak of Himself, but what things soever He shall hear, these shall He speak; and He shall declare . . . the things that are to come." He shall bear witness to the Son, and shall glorify Him. And He "will convict the world (which cannot receive Him, nor behold nor know Him) in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." And St. John even depicts for us Jesus' bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples at Jerusalem (Thomas being absent) for the power of remitting and retaining sins.

We have been thinking of how this gospel presents Jesus as "the Life," and as the Way of Life and to Life. There are two other closely allied terms which are peculiar to this book—light and truth.

"There was the true light, which lighteth every man, coming into the world," declares the evangelist. "I am the

light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life," declares the Master. Of the same import are: ix, 5; xii, 46, 35; iii, 19.

"The Word became flesh and dwelt among us . . . full of grace and truth," declares St. John. "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth," declares Jesus. "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life." The word of the Father is "truth" (xvii, 17). And the Holy Ghost is the "Spirit of truth," and will lead the disciples into all truth" (xiv, 17; xv, 26; xvi, 13). "The law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ."

In the Synoptics, the point of view of the people and of the wondering disciples very largely controls the picture of the Master. There we find a careful record of all of the great facts of the Incarnate Life—the Nativity, the Baptism, the Temptation, the Transfiguration, many of the miracles, the Passion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension. There we find also a large number of the sayings of Jesus. But these gospels stop short of presenting the full picture. These evangelists were chroniclers rather than interpreters. Doubtless they had not taken in and assimilated, when they wrote, the full import and meaning of the Lord's being, work, and teaching. Therefore they did not attempt to give a confident, consistent, well-planned presentation of His Divinity. Some of the hard sayings, the puzzling discourses, the mystical claims, and the astounding miracles they left unrecorded, together with a mass of material which has passed into oblivion because a fifth gospel was not written to preserve it.

Taking for granted the Synoptics, and building upon them, St. John has given us an interpretative narrative of the life of Christ and a carefully worked out portrait of the Master. He shows us, through deliberately chosen incidents and discourses, something of the fulness of the Lord's Divine claims and Divine Nature. He fills out the gospel picture of the teachings of Jesus — presenting thus His Sonship and also His mission as "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." He follows out certain themes, and thus fills out the gospel picture of the life of Jesus. So every touch, every detail, every line, is put in solely to contribute to one finished portrait. The result is a portrait of Jesus as the true Son of the living God, Divine and therefore eternal, incarnate in human flesh to bring a dead humanity into contact with God, alive in His glorified humanity forevermore.

Sunday Morning in Camp

BY THE REV. MARSHALL M. DAY.

MORNING! The clear sunlight comes stealing over the side of the dune far to the east, and all the birds promptly begin their chattering reveille. The Padre rolls over and looks at his watch. It is not more than half-past five, why not sleep a little longer? Why not indeed! To sleep late in the open is a crime almost to be ranked beside a dirty camp, or a fire carelessly left burning. These fresh young hours of the day's beginning are the finest, purest, freest, that the outdoors has to offer. Woe betide the camp which sleeps late, throwing away in mere forgetfulness the new-born energy of morning. Irregular and ill-cooked meals, an eventless, gameless day, these are but

their just portion. It is truer in the woodland than anywhere else that "he who would thrive must rise at five." But this is Sunday, and the good old American tradition of sleeping late on Sunday is so ingrained that, I doubt not, even the birds on this day lose all thought of the proverbial worm and "sleep-in" Sunday mornings.

Five-thirty! No later can be tolerated, and the Padre rolls out from the too enticing blankets, grunting sleepily till cold water has finished the work of the sunlight and he feels the new life of the morning glowing and coursing through every vein and muscle. Strange how a new access of energy hardens the heart of man. In the shelter of the tent it seemed a work of mercy to let those thirty or so tired boys sleep on and take their rest. They come from all conditions of life and from every grade of society; having but this in common, that they love the outdoors, and all live in the city, where the real outdoors does not exist. Through all the rest of the year every breath they draw is fouled with smoke and dust, and the numberless gasses pouring from the chimneys of their industrial home. What could be better for them than to sleep, here in the open, drawing in health and new vitality with every deep, but gentle breath? Now, however, the quivering life of morning has dispelled these vapors. To rouse the sleeping camp seems no longer a crime, but a gleeful lark, a game too good to be enjoyed alone. Walking softly to the open door of one of the tents the Padre draws forth a sleepily muttering small boy, with the gently spoken explanation: "Art, you've got to serve me this morning. Go down to the lake and duck-off and then we'll get most of the things ready before we wake the camp." A drowsy, tottering valetudinarian of some fifteen years goes staggering down the beach, obediently shedding his garments as he goes; an alert and vigor-

ous youngster of fifteen returns, fairly bouncing as he slaps himself into his khaki.

Five years they have worked together, the Padre and Art, so they feel nothing strange in their preparations. To be sure, a pack-sack is not a usual sort of sacristy, but it seems as commodious as that at home, and none could wish for linen more beautifully clean, albeit somewhat creased, than the vestments that come forth from its capacious depths. A tin cup and a pocket flask may be somewhat unusual cruets, but they serve their purpose as well as cut glass, and with less risk of loss or leakage when packed over hill and dale. Also to hear the priest say: "Be sure you have plenty of good-sized flat stones on the altar," seems at first a little odd, but the brisk morning breeze, just longing to flirt over pages and blow away the pall, gives a natural enough reason for the order. The Padre's cassock fits loose and scratchily over his soft hunting-shirt, and seems homesick for the accustomed stiffness of the Roman collar; but this incongruity is soon hidden under the folds of the amice, and presently the preparations are so far advanced that it is time to wake the camp.

At the sound of the whistle the beach fills rapidly with boys, and then as rapidly empties into the lake. The first ones out and dressed are set to work making a rousing fire, that there may be no delay when mass is over but coals will be all ready and waiting for the service of the cooks. Those to whom this latter duty is to fall are told off, so that they will fall to preparing the breakfast promptly on their return. Small disputes as to the ownership of cakes of soap or towels are adjusted, laggards are unceremoniously routed out of their blankets, and the camp dandies are exhorted to hurry with their prinking. In the midst of this confusion the Padre somehow finishes the reading of

his "Preparation" and the whole crowd goes trooping down to chapel.

The chapel is as primitive as in the days when the good Père Marquette journeyed along these very shores. Its altar is a heavy plank picked up amongst the flotsam and jetsam along the beach. The five rude crosses have been cut upon it with a hunter's axe, and four oak saplings have given up their lives to provide the long stakes that support this rough *mensa* at a proper height. Behind the altar a great cross has been erected, and no more of the work of men's hands will be found in this temple, whose floor is the yellow sand of the dune, whose ceiling is the clear dome of the summer sky, and whose organ tones are drawn from the crashing diapason of the surges endlessly pursuing one another to the shore. The boys have come and taken their places on the sand, the Padre has come, and vessels and book have been put in place, judiciously safeguarded with heavy flat stones. Now priest and server are standing side by side a little down hill from the altar, and the service will commence.

"I will go unto the Altar of God . . ." It is hard to say which is the more unaccountable: that believers in God do not more generally and inevitably love the great open spaces that are so peculiarly filled with Him, do not consider the heavens, the work of His fingers, and go often into the uninhabited places of the earth to meet Him; or the other wonder, that men can spend weeks and months in this great outdoor temple, instinct with pulsating life in every blade of grass or even grain of earth, and not learn to see in this superabundant life the Presence of the Lord of Life. A wiser, truer faith will learn to see in every moss-grown rock an Altar of God, in every branching tree an adumbration of the Tree of the Cross, and in all living things God's

servants that do His pleasure. Of course all this life is a struggle, the "struggle for existence," but struggle is of the very essence of joy, and tragedy means unhappiness only to the heart bereft of the heroic. Let us never sentimentalize over those who go down in this struggle for existence, except perhaps for those who refused to struggle, for the whole world has always envied him who "dies with his boots on," even like Siward the Strong and Cyrano simulating such a death when fate had snatched it from them. So then, this outdoor world and life is not a tragedy, but like Rostand's masterpiece, an "heroic comedy" in countless acts. The Confiteor and Kyrie appear in this outdoor light not as whining cries for mercy from a soul afraid to look up to its God, but the strong man's honest admission that there are yet powers he has not exercised, mistakes committed that should not have been made, victories possible that have not been attained.

Strange coincidence, or rather significant, is it not, that the Epistle for this Sunday should be from the writings of the Fisherman Apostle; and that the Holy Gospel pictures the Christ preaching from the stern of a fishing-boat to the people gathered by the lakeside, then launching out into the deep for that great and unheard-of catch which brought the rugged fishermen to their knees, recognizing at last in Him the power of God? Few people realize how full of outdoor life the Gospels are. Their scenery is all made up of lake and hills, and green fields waving in the summer wind, of the highways and the hedges. It is only in the last dark hours of rejection and betrayal that the background is not the sunlit countryside but the crowded streets, the courts and palaces, the congestion and fickleness of the city. Christ must often have slept beside the camp-fire,

wherever night overtook Him and His followers. So this camp-life has also been hallowed by the passage through it of God made Man, and most fittingly do we stand in such an atmosphere to confess our faith in Him. And now, when the Sacrifice has been consummated and the longed-for Presence comes, it is to no incongruous scene but in very deed and truth to His own home, to scenes that as Man He knew and loved, that we have invited our Lord, to receive our grateful homage and our thanks for that He has made His world so vast, so beautiful, and so good. In the hush that follows the Sacrifice's climax those who may receive are fed with the Bread of Life, the service is finished, and the Padre, turning from the altar, pronounces the Benediction.

They are back now by the tents, the vestments are folded and the vessels put away. The Padre is solicitously invoking the big, obstinate coffee-pot, that never will boil soon enough on these mornings when the cooks preëempt for their frying pans all the best places on the long cook-fire. The cooks are sweating profusely, and volubly reviling the fire-boy, who has thrown on some smoky driftwood at just the ideal time to fill their eyes and throats as they start the breakfast. Thirty healthy human boys are banging their spoons upon tin plates, and heaping good-natured abuse upon the cooks for their slowness, mixed with sage advice about the really proper way of making camp flapjacks. Camp life goes on as noisily as before. Perhaps a little more so, for each heart has been touched just a bit with the realization of the deep holiness of all-outdoors; and God forbid that any proper boy should be willing the world at large should suspect that he has felt an emotion.

The Church's Teaching of the Seven Sacraments

BY THE REV. ERNEST PUGH.

THAT the Church in its life and practice is infinitely greater than any formal statement of itself is amply exemplified in the question of the number of sacraments. One who does not know the Church from within but who is trying to know it from the Book of Common Prayer would readily believe that there are but two sacraments, and if he were to read as far as the Twenty-fifth Article he would feel that the Church held it a mortal sin to claim for it more than that number. As he might come closer into the life of the Church he would find a reverence for and a jealous care taken to preserve the Church's life through certain rites and ceremonies that would deeply impress him with their sacredness. There are not a few within the Church who are honestly puzzled as to the real attitude taken by the Church itself. From their earliest days, when in Sunday School they learnt their catechism, they have been taught that there are but two sacraments as generally necessary to salvation, yet the whole expression of the Church's life points to others as, at least, of a sacramental nature.

To lay the emphasis on the phrase "as generally necessary to salvation" does not fully meet the case. Article XXV attributes the characterization of the others as sacraments to, at least in part, a corrupt following of the Apostles. In the face of this article the foregoing phrase cannot be construed to imply without ambiguity that the Church teaches that there are seven sacraments two of which are generally necessary to salvation.

The real test of the Church's attitude must be found in its life and practice and the fundamental principles which govern that life. Catechisms and articles at their best are but the letter of the Church's self-expression and are often farthest from the real inner spirit.

There can be no doubt as to the two great sacraments given by the direct command of our Lord in which not only the general principles were given, but their statement and form. Matrimony and Extreme Unction might be somewhat hard to truly estimate if they stood alone, but they are inseparably bound up with the others, namely, Confirmation, Holy Orders and Penance. If only one of these last three should be shown to stand within the Church's life and practice as a genuine sacrament it would effectually set aside any mere formal statement in the Catechism or Articles. It is the purpose of this article to show that all these three are used within the Church in such a manner as will allow of no other interpretation than that of valid sacraments.

That a valid priesthood is necessary to valid sacraments is held by all classes of churchmen; that an apostolic episcopate is necessary to a valid priesthood is unanimously affirmed and carried out with the most rigid and painstaking care. That this is not a mere matter of law and order is shown by the fact that priests coming from other Communions which have a true apostolic episcopate are not required to be reordained, but any man coming from a Protestant body must be ordained Deacon and Priest. There is no other interpretation of this possible than that the Church holds that in the apostolic ordination through the laying on of the Bishop's hands—an outward and visible sign—there is given an inward and spiritual grace and power that alone can render the Orders valid. As a mere

matter of law and order the signing of a constitution would be sufficient for those who have been previously ordained in any religious body that held to the doctrines of the two sacraments and the Holy Trinity. By the Church's own teaching all that is necessary to constitute a valid sacrament is found in Holy Orders: there is an outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace, and no student of the New Testament can doubt that the Apostles went out to make disciples of every nation, baptizing them and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever their Lord had commanded them, with direct authority and Divine command to ordain others even as they themselves had been ordained. There can be little room for doubt that, at least, Ordination and Confirmation were among those things to be observed. The testimony of the Church in all ages has attributed the sacred orders of the ministry to a Divine origin.

The same outward sign and a similar inward grace is found in Confirmation: the layman's ordination to his life of devotion and service. Here again it might be attempted to interpret it as a matter of law and order. To this our reply must be that the teaching of the Church in all ages has been contrary to such a thought. If this had been a mere matter of discipline, why, in the earliest days of the Church, when in Samaria those who, under the preaching of Philip the deacon had believed and were baptized, were to receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, must Apostles be sent? Would it not seem more likely that Philip himself should have bestowed this gift as well as baptism upon them? Why, if this be but a matter of law and order, should we not entrust the administration of Confirmation to the parish priest, who surely knows the candidates better than the Bishop ever can? Once again, no explanation

of the attitude of the universal Church will suffice except that this is in direct obedience to the specific commands of our Lord, or such as were received by them from that Comforter who was to lead them into all truth.

If an apostolic episcopate and a valid priesthood are, on account of their inward and spiritual nature, necessary to valid sacraments, and if, as the Church demands in her teachings and services, confirmation, confession, and absolution are necessary to a reception of Holy Communion, and that Holy Communion is necessary to salvation, it is only logical to claim that Holy Orders, Confirmation and Penance are also necessary.

That these three have, in the life and practice of the Church, completely annulled the lettered statement to the contrary prepares the way for the other two.

That marriage is a Divine law by which, not only two bodies, but two souls, are made one is the teaching of the Church. That matrimony is more than a mere contract agreed to by two parties is seen in the words "Those whom God hath joined." The final priestly blessing is of exactly the same nature as the pronouncing of the absolution or the apostolic blessing. As the priest holds the clasped hands of the man and woman and declares that God has made them one, who can deny that with the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace anything is lacking that makes it a real sacrament?

Extreme Unction has been so almost universally neglected among us that, were it not for the direct scriptural command, it would indeed be hard to recognize as a sacrament of the Church. In this, however, we have a clearer scriptural warrant than we have for Holy Matrimony. In St. Mark's Gospel we find the twelve Apostles not only preaching but anointing with oil and thereby healing the

sick under the direction of our Lord Himself. The explicit command is given in the Epistle of St. James, chapter 5, verses 14 and 15:

“Is there any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he hath committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.”

That the Church may, from time to time, have neglected or even denied any or all of its sacraments, does not lessen either their truth or value. Through all the blunderings of the Church a Divine Providence has cared for its life and preserved in a wonderful way the sacred gifts and truths once committed to the saints. Today, in the hour of the world's sorest need, there is being granted to us a fuller and deeper conception of God's will concerning us; and as we are led to see the fullest meaning of the Church's great ministrations for us, so much the nearer shall we be drawn to that close communion with God through Christ, where alone, amid the mystery and pain of the present, can the soul really be calm and know with certainty that

“Nothing can separate us from the love of Christ.”

BOOK REVIEWS

The Revelation of John. By Charles C. Whiting. Boston: Richard G. Badger.

The preface to this little volume tells us that the author has attempted “to reach an interpretation . . . that will be reasonable, in accord with modern scholarship, and at the same time so simple that the ordinary layman will find it easily within his grasp.” He has had considerable success in this effort and we are glad to commend the book to our readers.

No book in the Bible has been more misunderstood, and few have been more perverted in the service of false and malicious doctrines. Yet, in spite of this and the difficulties it must always present, it has, in every generation been a source of inspiration and strength to the servants of God, and has in particular furnished the suggestion for many of the most glorious hymns of the Church. We believe it has a very special message for our own times, and we wish that many of the clergy might be led to its careful study and to giving their people the help of lectures and sermons on its true meaning. Swete, Milligan, Scott, Ramsay, Charles, Porter, and Gibson would supply material, and the treatment in the volume in hand may hint the manner and degree in which they could make their labors useful to others. We may add that, while we would not go with the exegesis in every detail, it is always sane, reverent, and free from sectarian prejudice. An original translation in modern English is printed at the end of the book. On the whole it is well done, though we doubt its necessity, and we shiver a little when we read "To the thirsty one I will give to drink gratuitously of the fountain of the water of life."

C. C. E.

How the Gospel Spread Through Europe. By Charles H. Robinson, D.D. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This appears to be practically a condensation of the author's work entitled "The Conversion of Europe." The last mentioned book was reviewed recently in the *American Church Monthly*. This shorter treatise is well adapted for use as a text-book in the history of early Christian Missions. As the arrangement is by nations or countries each chapter forms an introduction to the work of the Christian Church in each land, and from this beginning the development in the later centuries can be worked out by means of other books. Not the least suggestive is the chapter on The Results of Christian Missions in Europe.

A. W. J.

The Man of Kerioth. By Robert Norwood. New York: George H. Doran Co.

In the Introduction by Robert Johnston we are told that this dramatic poem is "an essay towards an estimate of the character of Jesus consistent with our ideas of great manhood, and for an interpretation of His religion, at least not irreconcilable with the assured findings of modern

knowledge." That is an ambitious design. What really is meant is that the author is intent upon bringing out the human nature of Christ where the Evangelists have been reserved in their memoirs and comments. We are carried through a series of scenes, on the banks of the Jordan where St. John Baptist is preaching, in the roof-garden of Mary Magdalene, at the Marriage Feast in Cana, in Capernaum, and in the Garden of Gethsemane. Many of the familiar persons from the Gospel narratives are introduced, but Judas, the Man of Kerioth, is really the central figure, and his character is portrayed along the traditional theory that Judas was a disappointed and ambitious man, who really did not mean to compass his Master's death, but only to force an issue with the Jewish hierarchy and the Roman officials. In the end the portraiture which the poet has delineated seems to be of Judas but not of our Lord. This is what the outcome is bound to be. The marvellous picture of the Christ of the Gospels cannot be added to or improved upon. Fancy and imagination may be given full play, but it is impossible to supercede the Gospels.

A. W. J.

Christian Evidence Pamphlets. By the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A. S. P. C. K.

This series includes the following subjects: No. 1, Materialism; No. 2, Disbelief in God; No. 3, Can Man Know God?; No. 4, Reasons for Believing in God; No. 5, Religion and Natural Science; No. 6, Prayer and Science; No. 7, Survival After Death; No. 8, Morality Without Religion.

These pamphlets are of a uniform length of sixteen pages, and being so moderate in cost, and containing a very able treatment of fundamental problems of religion, deserve a wide circulation, and would also be most useful as the basis of a course of Lectures or Instructions on Christian Evidences.

Hymns of the Eastern Church Translated, with Notes and an Introduction. By the late Rev. J. M. Neale, D.D. S. P. C. K. 1918.

This edition of Dr. Neale's work marks the author's centenary.

With the exception of the work of a few scholars very little search has been made into the treasures of Greek Church poetry, partly no doubt on account of the difficulties of the rhythm. But here we have in brief the results of a careful study of oriental hymnology. We are thankful that

the editors of our new hymns have retained no less than seven beautiful and well-known hymns of oriental origin, notably the glorious old hymn of victory, "The Day of Resurrection," and "Come ye faithful, raise the strain," and the justly loved "Art thou weary."

We doubt if there can be found elsewhere in a small compass so much information as to the hymnology of the Eastern Church.

In the King's Service. By the Rev. G. R. Oakley, M.A., B.D. S. P. C. K. 1918.

This is an Octave of Addresses to Boys and Girls. A charming little book full of wholesome spiritual teachings and enlivened by just the right use of anecdotes. The subjects treated are briefly, Sin and the Saviour, Converse with Him, and Work for His Sake. But no synopsis of these simple lessons can do justice to them. They deserve to be read by young and old.

Life by His Death. Practical Meditations at the Cross of Jesus upon the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. By Bernard M. Hancock. S. P. C. K.

These Meditations are founded upon the Seven Last Words, and are designed as a devotional preparation for the use of the Visitation Office, which in the English Book differs slightly from ours. The booklet may be used not only by the clergy but by the laity, and its helpful suggestions will be welcome both to the sick and to the whole.

The Evangelistic Work of the Church. Being the Report of the Archbishops' Third Committee of Inquiry. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1918.

In this report the whole subject is discussed at length. Growing out of a nation-wide Mission, similar to our own of some years ago, it is of great value. To our regret, the results of that Mission are not given. On the whole the subject is handled in a constructive spirit. Much stress is laid on the spiritual preparation of both the clergy and the laity. A carefully planned organization for the whole Church, the various dioceses, and the individual parishes is suggested; and both laymen and laywomen are to be given a share in the work. Much stress is laid on the *charismata* needful in the individual missionary. The experiences of past revivals in England, Scotland, Wales, on the European continent, and

in America, is adduced. Naturally much is said about the machinery of the revival or mission. The work of the "Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland" is given much space. A notable feature is the strong statement that interest in Foreign Missions greatly stimulates the home work and has a decided effect on the success of evangelistic work. In connection with this, we note there is an interesting supplement on the Church's Missionary Work. Emphasis is laid on the need of the Power of the Holy Ghost, and on the witnessing power of the Christian living of the individual. The report should be read by all who take any interest in this very important subject. Much in the report will prove helpful to our own missionaries, as well as to dioceses and parishes planning a mission.

F. C. H. W.

The Administrative Reform of the Church. Being the Report of the Archbishops' Fourth Committee of Inquiry.

To American Church people this report should prove most interesting. Many of the reforms suggested are either in line with the Constitution of our Church, or are *desiderata* after which we also are striving. Among those things that are ours by right of the Constitution is the giving to the dioceses at least some share in the choice of their diocesans. The radical suggestion of the committee practically to deprive the Prime Minister of the right of appointment is not agreed to by all the members, one of them dissenting *in toto*. Other interesting suggestions are joint sessions of the two Convocations, together with freedom from Parliamentary control, Diocesan Councils of Advice, and Parochial Councils, all giving the laity, both men and women, a larger share in the administration of the Church. Another suggestion is that of a Central Council for the whole Church. Other matters dealt with are the methods of appointing the parochial clergy, clerical pensions, minimum stipends on a "living basis," abolition of pew rents, age limitations for rectors or vicars and bishops, and many others of less importance. All suggested reforms are in the direction of liberating the English Church more and more from the control of the civil government. This committee, however, is by no means unanimous, various "memoranda" or, as we would call them, "minority reports," having been filed with the main report.

F. C. H. W.

St. Ambrose "On the Mysteries" and the Treatise On the Sacraments. By an Unknown Author. Translated by the Rev. T. Thompson, B.D.,

and with Introduction and Notes by the Rev. J. H. Srawley, D.D. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1919.

The translation of these two treatises is excellently done. Begun by Mr. Thompson, it was completed after his untimely death in 1917, by Mr. F. H. Colson. We are glad to see St. Ambrose's "De Mysteris" and the anonymous "De Sacramentis" made accessible to those who find the ecclesiastical Latin of the period difficult reading. Dr. Srawley's Introduction is a splendid piece of work. It clearly sets forth all of the liturgical and doctrinal implications of these two important sets of instructions, for originally they were sermons or lectures delivered to the newly baptized Christians. Among other interesting things he brings out is that St. Ambrose was one of the first of the Latin Fathers to insist on the sacramental change of the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, which teaching became the basis of the later Roman teaching that resulted, finally, in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. This little volume can be cordially commended to all who are interested in the development of the Church's Liturgical and Doctrinal Systems.

F. C. H. W.

Texts for Students. Edited by Caroline A. J. Skeel, D.Lit.; H. J. White, D.D.; and J. P. Witney, D.D., D.C.L. 1918 and 1919. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Of this new series of most handy texts, seven have so far appeared: 1, Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, illustrative of the Christianity of the First Century; 2, Selections from Matthew of Paris; 3, Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis; 4, *Libri Sancti Patricii*; 5, A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick; 6, Selections from the Vulgate; 7, The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome. The texts are all ably edited, and the translation of St. Patrick's Latin writings is very good. The introductions are all excellent, especially that to the selections from the Vulgate by Dr. White. We might have preferred to see the texts arranged in their chronological order, but the lack of this is hardly a serious fault. These booklets will be of great value to students desirous of getting some knowledge of the vast literature from which they are taken and unwilling or unable to procure the great folios themselves.

The New Citizenship. By Prof. A. T. Robertson, M.A., D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company.

This book is one of the many produced because of the late war; it is the "reaction"—to use the word now in vogue—of the author's mind to the new situation "due partly to a month with the Y. M. C. A. Army School for Secretaries at Blue Ridge, N. C." Professor Robertson has a multitudinous list of books to his credit; this one seems to be a collection of popular sermons which would be called epigrammatical, if one were polite; the Church Tramp would call them "snappy." The leadership of our Blessed Lord in our problems of the moment is shown; the author is in agreement with Chesterton and a thousand others that the world of tomorrow must be of quite a different sort from our present world, and he is in agreement with the readers of this MONTHLY that Christianity thoroughly applied is the sole solution for all our distresses. There are many good words in the book, but it does not possess an excess of the adventurous spirit, that temper which some say is the very essence of Christ's teaching; I mean that Professor Robertson says pleasantly what nearly everyone else is saying, things it is very safe to say. Certainly the Early Christians neither said nor did safe things. Of course, the question of one's duty to the state is considered; the author rightly considers the necessity of separation between Church and State; but like too many writers, he seems to have fallen into the state-cultus, which came to such tragic climax in Germany. Conscience is said to be supreme, and yet one is not to question the right of states to draft its citizens for warfare, even if, as in so many cases, the individual conscience sees its duty in the path of peace and follows that path sometimes very heroically. It is a queer thing that in this country the famous conscientious objectors have received the severest criticism from clergymen, who do not often go to battle; while some of their protagonists have been men like Lord Robert Cecil in England and some of our army officers here. It was remarked recently that at the great feasts of Easter and the Nativity during the late war, the newspapers, with rare exceptions, carried the strongest messages of religion, while the pulpits for the most part were giving a long-suffering public those things which they had so fully elsewhere. However conventional the book before us may be, deep spots are occasionally touched and the book is decently and reverently written. The man knows his Bible, and there are few things finer that one can say of anybody.

ALBERT FARR.